

Also, memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of German-American Alliance, La Crosse, Wis., protesting against export of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Bay State Automobile Association, favoring Adamson bill to eliminate discrimination against motorists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. S. Louis & Son, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petitions of S. N. Evans and Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Roberts, of Little Rock, Ark., protesting against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of 42 persons of Butler, Pa., favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting the shipment of arms and ammunition to warring nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 20919, for the relief of Edward H. Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 21048, for the relief of Anna Harleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLELLAN: Petition of Herbert L. Rickard, pastor Presbyterian Church, Hudson, N. Y.; Mrs. O. S. Griffin, county superintendent Mercy Woman's Christian Temperance Union; M. Catherine Allen, Mount Lebanon; Frederick Du Bois, of Highland, N. Y.; urging support and passage at this session of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Augustus Kohler and 123 others, of Kingston; Howard Moshier and Frederick Letzner, of Ellenville, N. Y.; favoring prohibition of export of arms, etc., by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Walter W. Reid and 52 others, of Monticello, N. Y., urging passage of Palmer-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of interdenominational meeting held at Friends' Meeting House, West Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any increase in the armed strength of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens and organizations of Pennsylvania, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of St. Michael's Polish Society, of Pittsburgh, Pa., against restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of meeting of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa., against increased appropriations for the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of priests of Scranton (Pa.) diocese and J. J. Curran, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., against passage through the mails of certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petition of Local Union No. 119, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, urging a satisfactory solution of the matter of employing American citizens in the various departments of the work on the Panama Canal in preference to aliens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for relief of Henry Borman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of F. L. Rector, E. A. Stewart, and H. Montgomery, of Summit, Cal., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Solano County, Cal., and Women's Civic Club of Eureka, Cal., favoring civil-service retirement; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of J. Shillinger, D. S. McCarthy, C. F. Merkle, H. E. Sonntag, and E. B. Powers, of Chicago Park; Franz Fritsche, of Sonora; John A. Schroeder and others, of Mariposa, all in the State of California, and citizens of New Orleans, La., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Hardware Manufacturing Corporation and the S. S. Thompson Co., of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the

passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of 5,000 persons of the Order of the D. O. H. of Connecticut; Court Schiller, No. 117, F. of A., of Meriden, Conn.; and Windhorst Benevolent Society, of Meriden, protesting against export of arms, etc., by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petitions of sundry Polish societies of the State of Illinois, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of citizens of Perth Amboy, N. J., favoring House joint resolution 377, to prohibit export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Mercer County (N. J.) Branch of American Federation of Catholic Societies, against use of the mails by publication called the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of 150 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against Senate bill 6865, prohibiting sale of liquors in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Memorial of the Memphis (Tex.) Commercial Club, favoring Federal aid in building a national highway from the Gulf of Mexico to Denver, Colo., via Memphis, Tex.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of board of trustees of the German Baptist Church of Boston, Mass., favoring passage of bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 880 American citizens for the adoption of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of German-American Alliance of Gladstone, N. Dak., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 30, 1915.

The House was called to order at 11 o'clock a. m. by Mr. UNDERWOOD, as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, who hast set Thy glory above the heavens.*

Help us, we pray Thee, to set our glory above the material, that we may rise out of the eating, drinking, counting man into the realms of the higher values; that truth may be stronger than wealth, nobility of soul than the plaudits of men, righteousness than temporal power; that our souls may touch the Eternal Soul and bring us into perfect harmony with the eternal fitness of things, after the manner of the Christ. And Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### SEGREGATION OF RACES IN STREET CARS.

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have three legislative days in which to file a minority report on the bill (H. R. 1718) to require all transportation companies, firms, and persons within the District of Columbia to provide separate accommodations for the white and negro races and to prescribe punishments and penalties for violating its provisions (H. Rept. 1340, pt. 2).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS] asks unanimous consent that he may have three legislative days in which to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 1718. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WILBER H. ESTEY.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] presents a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 686 (H. Rept. 1339).

Whereas Wilber H. Estey was the clerk of the Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, Jr., late a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the thirty-first district of the State of New York, and is not entitled to compensation under the law as such clerk after the death of the said Hon. Edwin A. Merritt, Jr.: Therefore be it



*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Wilber H. Estey, out of the contingent fund of the House, the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Member of the House.

Mr. LLOYD. It is just following a precedent that has been established.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE ON THE IMMIGRATION BILL (H. DOC. NO. 1527).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, some days ago, when the President's message vetoing the immigration bill was read on the floor of the House, the usual request followed for the publication of that message, and it was objected to. Since that time several resolutions have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Printing asking for the publication of this message. As a House document there have been printed 420 copies of the President's message in a pamphlet, which also carries the full text of the Burnett immigration bill. As a House document we are entitled under the present arrangement to 420 copies of it—not enough to supply one copy to each Member—but the Joint Committee on Printing under the law has the privilege of ordering a reprint of any public document to a number costing not more than \$200. Under this law I have signed an order, as chairman of the Committee on Printing, for the publication of \$200 worth of copies of this message and the bill combined, which will furnish 23,250 copies for the document room. I want to announce, so that the announcement may appear in the RECORD, that those copies will probably be available for Members to-morrow morning, and if that number does not prove sufficient and the demand is really pressing for more, the resolutions that have been introduced will then be considered by the Committee on Printing.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON EDUCATION.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to present a request for unanimous consent. On July 8, 1914, Senate joint resolution 157 was passed, and request was made by unanimous consent to lay on the table the House resolution—House joint resolution 291. The Clerk made a mistake and laid on the table House joint resolution 273, which was reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and which is a somewhat similar resolution to the Senate resolution 186.

I ask that the RECORD be corrected, and also the Journal, and that the House joint resolution 273 take its place on the calendar, as it would have done if this mistake had not been made. It is Calendar No. 246.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is too late to correct the RECORD and the Journal of this Congress. As I understand, under the order of the House, which was intended to apply to one resolution, the clerks were a little confused by resolutions covering somewhat the same subject and laid the wrong resolution on the table. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent to have that resolution taken from the table and restored to the calendar and that the proper resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask, then, that the House joint resolution 273 be taken from the table and restored to the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is that House resolution 273 be taken from the table and restored to the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 20975, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I have for many years voted against large armaments. I have thought that the rule of

force, the doctrine that might makes right, was steadily yielding to the enlightened love of justice, that a respect for the opinion of the civilized world was supplanting respect for the sword, and that in international life, as in private life, an appeal to law and to courts was displacing the appeal to battle.

I confess that recent events have caused me to revise my opinions. Among those nations which we have considered most progressive and civilized has suddenly burst forth a worship of force, a reversion to the primitive savage type, a lawless selfishness, a disregard of sacred obligations, of pity, of mercy, and of humanity, which is depressing and confounding. There is only one encouraging symptom. Amidst all this wreck of civilization there has issued from every nation involved an appeal to the judgment of the neutral world and an attempt to absolve itself from responsibility, which indicates a consciousness that after all there is another arbitrament than the sword and that the tribunal of public opinion is still recognized, respected, and feared. But there is no escape from the discouraging fact that in this enlightened age innocence will not insure against attack and that a nation which leads in the race of civilization may with cold-blooded deliberation plunge into a war of selfish aggression. What is our duty under these new conditions?

Although the shock may well disturb our complacent sense of security, we must not allow it to frighten us into hysterical apprehension or excite us into belligerent emulation. It is, above all, a time when we should keep calm and try to determine our necessities with cool and even-tempered judgment, without panic and without bellicose ambition. A navy and an army are not playthings to be indulged in from a jealous vanity that will not be content while our neighbor's toys are better than ours; they are simply a method of insuring possessions, and as in all forms of insurance the difficult problem is to ascertain truly the risk. That will be rated differently according to one's temperament, environment, and interest. Allowing that everyone was equally impartial, the results would differ greatly. By weighing as carefully as I can the various elements I have made up my mind what premium of insurance I think it wise to pay, and with diffidence and a profound recognition that only a real prophet could be certain that his conclusions were right I submit my opinion.

The first point to determine is the danger to be insured against. While the present European condition safeguards us against immediate attack, yet at the same time it vividly impresses us with the terrible effects of war and how science and invention have so changed conditions that a mighty but unequipped nation is helpless before a relatively small army furnished with modern engines of destruction, which can prevent the most heroic valor and endless numbers ever approaching near enough to inflict injury, and which can mow their irresistible way to certain victory. When the present European war ends is there danger that the victorious weapons will be turned against us? If there is, we can not too quickly begin to train our soldiers by the hundreds of thousands and manufacture artillery and ammunition on a corresponding scale, for if either side shall completely triumph it will possess the fleets of all and could easily sweep us from the sea and land here an army against which our enormous but untrained population would be helpless. Against such an attack the preparations urged by the most extreme and apprehensive advocates of increased defenses would be impotent; we need not to increase, but to revolutionize our whole system. The end of a war does not, as is sometimes suggested, leave the victor weak, but he is generally at the maximum of his fighting power and ready for new conquests, and we must recognize that it is easier to-day than ever before for one nation to be permanent masters of the world. A hundred years ago, when France had subjugated Europe, the means of transporting troops and intelligence were so slow and armaments so simple that the subject nations could organize and equip armies before their conqueror could prevent them. To-day if one power were mistress of Europe it could disarm other nations and forbid their organizing new armies, and so omnipotent is artillery and so slow its manufacture and so rapid transmission of news and troops that the conqueror, perfectly armed, could suppress any outbreak before it became formidable and keep all nations in permanent subjection. It is not difficult to conceive that if a military power should once establish its supremacy—by a complete victory, for instance, in the present war—it might disarm the rest of Europe, compel the other nations by annual tribute to support its armies permanently with perfect equipment, and thus establish a complete and inviolable despotism until perhaps after long years the demoralizing disintegration of such a military aristocracy worked its own downfall.



But I think that danger is slight. It does not look as if either side was likely to win a complete triumph, and in that case their mutual jealousies and fears will protect us in the future as in the past. And yet it is possible to conceive that if Germany should win and emerge completely master of Europe she might look across the ocean and see this commercial, helpless people, gorged with the wealth which had accumulated here while European capital was wasted and destroyed; and she might, without even a pretext except lust of power and dominion, send across and tie us to her chariot wheels with the rest of Europe. But, while conceivable, I do not think that danger is probable enough to warrant any expenditure to forestall it. Any ordinary preparation would be wasted; it must be either thorough or none at all. I have too high an opinion of the German character to insure against such an unprovoked aggression.

If, on the other hand, the allies should completely triumph whom have we to fear? Certainly not France. Certainly not Russia. England is the only possible menace. And an unprovoked attack from England is quite as inconceivable as from Germany. England is governed by public opinion. Its great English colonies are dependent only in name. They can separate when they will. She can have no ambition or hope to again annex us to the Crown. She can never become a great military despotism. I do not believe that, if she should be a victor in this war, she would wish to direct her newly developed military prowess against us. At any rate, I would risk waiting till the end of this war before insuring against that danger.

There is, indeed, one prolific source of conflict—the Monroe doctrine. That has never been acknowledged by Europe; it has no basis in law or convention or natural justice; it is a threat which we publish against a whole hemisphere, and whose only sanction can be in the physical force behind it. Its original purpose, of course, long ago passed away. For generations there has been no danger that any European nation would interfere in South America in order to perpetuate monarchical institutions. The motives which inspired the Holy Alliance would no longer actuate any European nation. But the doctrine which developed as a defense and protest against that alliance is still worshiped as a fetish, although its original motive is lost and it is perverted to quite different ends. I see no justification for it now in law or reason except self-interest, and that, when given as an excuse for breach of law, has not of late met much favor. No nation has ever cared to raise the issue with us, but if the prize was great enough or if our weakness was manifest, I can easily imagine that a nation might challenge the Monroe doctrine and assert that we had no international right to decide what should become of South America. I see but one reason why we should be unwilling to have lands south of us colonized by Europe, and that is fear of a fortified base of operations against us. But England and France and Spain already have such harbors. Against them, therefore, the argument does not apply. And if Venezuela for the past 20 years had been under English control it would have been vastly better for Venezuela, for the United States, and for the world.

If France had succeeded in establishing its power in Mexico in the sixties and we had acquiesced, I do not think we or Mexico would have suffered from the change. It is not at all improbable that but for the present war European nations might recently have said to us, "The lives and property of our subjects are being sacrificed in Mexico by a government which you were instrumental in establishing. We demand that you secure safety for our subjects or we shall interfere ourselves." Or it is possible that they might have interfered without even the preliminary appeal to us. Some of the nations to the south of us seem to enjoy indulging in breaches of obligations and violations of the rights of others, and then hope to go unpunished because the Monroe doctrine makes us their sponsors and defenders. Such a one-sided doctrine needs revision or abandonment. To me it seems a most probable and prolific source of war.

There is one other possible antagonist—Japan. And I would like to say here that I appreciate how impolitic and unwise it is to thus discuss publicly our relations with other nations and to treat them as problematical enemies. The mere suggestion of such relations tends to weaken friendship. As a maiden has taken the first long step toward surrender when she contemplates with herself its possibility, so a nation makes more easy and probable a conflict when she openly discusses its possible causes and chances. I deprecate such debate. But it has been precipitated by others, has become general and absorbing, and the question of our preparedness for war can not be answered without its free consideration. But if the situation demands discussion and frankness, we can at least be considerate, friendly, and respectful; and I feel like admitting that the danger of collision with Japan lies not with her but with

ourselves. The attitude of some of our States has been so contemptuous, has so singled the Japanese out for unfriendly legislation, that you can not blame a high-spirited and powerful people, which has of late given so many proofs of its equality both as a nation and as individuals, if it resents bitterly being treated as an inferior and an outcast. Nor does it seem improbable that if this discourteous and irritating conduct continues it may cause a wave of outraged resentment to sweep the Japanese people into a hostile outbreak. We can not leave those who give just cause for such an attack to suffer alone, and must come to their defense. But in such a war, while I recognize that Japan could put in the field an army which would readily overwhelm ours, yet I believe our Navy is superior and that she would never dare attempt a landing on our shores. The Philippines, of course, we would lose. We would not even pretend to defend them outside of our forts. Any warships we had there would steam for home, and it would not take Japan long to overrun the country.

I have never been able to see why we should fortify those islands, for we could never defend them against any strong oriental power. But I should not mourn over their loss, because I have always considered them a burden rather than an advantage. I would gladly sell them now for what they cost us, and the natives would doubtless gladly be sold except for the hope that from us they will some day receive independence. But after the Philippines were lost I can not see that a war with Japan alone would have any serious effect on either combatant. Neither side would dare to send its navy to the distant home of its enemy, and we could but hurl epithets at each other across the Pacific, only varied by an occasional daring raid. Our Navy is certainly not so weak that it should fear attack in our own waters, and I can not conceive it so strong that public opinion would allow it to go 4,000 miles from home. Against war with Japan I do not think we are unprepared, and I am ashamed to admit that if such a war should come, it would probably be due to the unreasonable and unfeeling conduct of our own people. If we will but be patient and reasonable, and not follow demagogues, the problem of Japanese immigration can be satisfactorily solved through diplomatic channels. Japan does not wish her people to emigrate here, but she does not wish our laws to discriminate against her alone.

There is one other danger against which we must insure, and that is our emotional, self-satisfied, undisciplined spirit, which is constantly inflamed by the flatteries of Fourth of July orators claiming that we can whip a world in arms, and which might blaze up on any slight provocation and drive even a reluctant administration into war. Or we may have Presidents who will attack another nation because of the punctilio of a salute and who may not have the prudence to select an opponent of inferior size. A nation always ready to fight at the drop of the hat ought indeed to be fully armed, and one great benefit from this agitation about our preparedness for war is that it may convince us that it is wise to be less aggressive and belligerent and overbearing and more just and reasonable and pacific in our relations with other nations. It may make us realize that for war we are not a first-class power, and that instead of being able to "lick all creation" there is not a nation with a modern army which, if once landed on our shores, could not march resistlessly all over our continent. The army of Germany, Austria, Russia, France, England, Italy, Japan—any one of them could easily overthrow any force we could muster and take possession of our richest cities. If we wish to indulge our tendency to be self-willed and arbitrary and unyielding and dictatorial, then this war teaches us that we ought to begin to spend hundreds of millions a year in military preparations to defend that tendency. Unless we will be considerate and pacific and reasonable, we certainly are unprepared. But I should be glad to have our condition force upon us those commendable qualities.

One branch of our defense is thorough and adequate—our coast protections—and the criticism of it seems to me either blind to its real purposes or misinformed. Coast defenses are meant for a temporary check, not a permanent defense. They are not designed to protect us against an adversary whose army and navy are both superior to ours. Such an opponent, after demolishing our Navy, has but to land on an unfortified part of the coast and take our cities from the rear. We are protected against a sudden naval raid and nothing more. But against any adversary who does not dare land an army our coast defenses are impregnable. I do not believe a hostile navy would dare to attack them. Here and there may be a weak spot easily remedied, and while our guns must keep pace with the increasing power of the guns on battleships, we need not fear that our protected cities are in any danger of assault



by sea. An insufficient quota of trained artillerists for a full war basis is their greatest weakness.

I have thus discussed our dangers and our weakness. There is nothing hidden about them. Anyone can see them. They are not novel, though the present war has taught some new lessons. Their imminence and seriousness is a matter on which men will necessarily differ. How much risk you are willing to take will depend on temperament. To insure against all risk, we ought first to have a trained and equipped army of at least 500,000 men, with a reserve of as many more. That involves an annual additional expense just about equal to the present cost of the National Government. It involves conscription and compulsory service and a vast pension list, for the attempt to provide an adequate reserve by the militia has pitifully failed.

I think few persons would think the insurance worth the cost under present conditions. They would take the risk of waiting till the end of the present war. Between that establishment and our present Army, which is small but efficient, and capable of meeting any emergencies which may arise on this continent alone, I see no rational stopping place, unless it is to provide an ample garrison for Hawaii.

With the Navy the question to me is more difficult. With the recent changes in construction and ordnance, and the lessons taught by recent naval battles, the efficient force of our Navy is hard to estimate. I think here we can not afford to deteriorate, and, though I have misgivings about the distribution of the present appropriation, yet I have decided to support the program of the committee.

I am not without strong hope that the end of this war will solve some of our questionings. For a generation Europe has been an armed camp, with cost steadily mounting. We became so accustomed to it that we began to talk about it as an assurance of peace, and to persuade ourselves that handling the weapons of war did not beget war. But at last the crash came, and we see now how inevitable it was, and that these stupendous preparations could not be wasted forever. But their permanent expense is unbearable, and we must hope that in the treaties of peace some provision for general disarmament and the release into private activities of these enormous masses of men and of expenditure will be provided. When that glad day comes we can judge better of our duty. It may come before the appropriations in this bill are even allotted and change all our planning.

Meanwhile, the sensational agitation for an increase of our military establishment may have one unintended good result, if it brings home to us the fact that though perhaps the richest we are by no means the strongest nation of the world; that our wealth and commercial absorption is a temptation to a poorer but more martial nation to pick a quarrel with us, and so is a liability as well as an asset; and that arrogance and swagger are as unsafe as they are unbecoming. It may teach us that forbearance and courtesy are as prudent as they are admirable.

We have tried to lead in the movement for peace among nations, not, I believe, simply because it was for our interest, but because we thought it would benefit the whole world. This war has cruelly demolished that ideal. It has postponed indefinitely the realization of our hopes. But it ought not to discourage our purpose. It certainly shows in more lurid light than ever before the hideousness and destructiveness of war, the fallacy of the doctrine that the consciousness of great military power promotes peace.

If we wish to rank as an equal among the great military powers of the world, and to be absolutely secure against aggression or insult, and to be able ourselves to be domineering and self-willed, then I agree our only safe course is to double our Navy and increase our Army fivefold. But if we are willing to tread the more honorable path of justice and moderation and forbearance, relying upon the delicate balance of power in Europe to protect us in the future as it has in the past, and hoping that the treaty of peace will effectually curtail and limit future dangers and expenditures, then the appropriations we are this year making for our Army and our Navy are, in my opinion, a sufficient insurance against the risks which we can reasonably apprehend.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY, MISCELLANEOUS.

The Secretary of the Navy shall send to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session a complete schedule or list showing the amount of money of all pay and for all allowances for each grade of officers in the Navy, including retired officers, and for all officers included in this act and for all enlisted men so included.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. If I recall correctly, this same paragraph is in the current law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What is the object of repeating it? How many times do you want the Secretary of the Navy to send a report to Congress giving precisely the same information?

Mr. PADGETT. It shows the officers who have been changed each year, and it shows the expenditures during each fiscal year. It gives to Congress the benefit of the information.

Mr. MANN. I may not know what this means, and probably do not. I supposed when it was in the bill last year that it was intended to furnish the Congress information as to how much pay and allowances were granted to each grade of the Navy—not the total sum that had been paid for the preceding fiscal year. That is information that comes in the estimates, anyhow. The pay and allowances of each grade of the Navy do not vary from year to year.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. What is the use of publishing it every year in an annual report?

Mr. PADGETT. The amount changes from year to year.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but that is the total. I supposed the purpose of this was so that we could find out how much the pay and allowances of a lieutenant or a lieutenant commander and other officers after so many years' service amounted to.

Mr. PADGETT. It was that, and also to give a report of the expenditure in the different grades.

Mr. MANN. That is not what it says. What was the report made by the Secretary in December?

Mr. PADGETT. He reported what is paid to the different grades.

Mr. MANN. In a separate report?

Mr. PADGETT. No; in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. He gives that every year, and always has done it. That is not a compliance with this section of the law. I do not know; it may be necessary to enact it every year to get the Secretary to act on it. I do not think he has made any report this year.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recollect of any except in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. But that is not a compliance with this provision. We have had a provision in the law requiring him to make a report so that Members of Congress may know something which they never yet have been able to find out—how much the pay and allowances of naval officers amount to. I dare say that no member of the committee can tell offhand.

Mr. PADGETT. No; not offhand; but I think you will find it set out in the Yearbook.

Mr. MANN. You can find there that they have allowances for light and heat, and so forth, and you may make a computation yourself; but when you have done that you will find that they have medical attention, or something else of that sort which you did not know anything about and which you have not included. I suppose it was to give that information, which I think would be very valuable, but I see no objection in putting it into the bill every year. If we get it once, we will have it until there is a change in the law. The fact is the Secretary of the Navy has not complied with the law that we put in the last bill. I will not make a point of order now; but if he does not comply with the law this year I will make it in the next. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I did not understand the chairman to say that a report had actually been made in accordance with this provision last year.

Mr. PADGETT. I said it was contained in the estimates, and then there is information given in the yearbook and also in the statistics issued by the department showing the allowances to each grade.

Mr. MOORE. If my recollection is correct, there was a desire to ascertain the amount paid to retired officers as distinguished from those in the active service.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will turn to page 1077 of the estimates, he will find the detailed expenses of the pay of the Navy. He will see that it takes up the grade of admiral and the different grades and gives it in detail.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for the reference; but was it not the intent to obtain a separate report from the Secretary of the Navy which should be sent to Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Beginning on page 1077 of the estimates, in appendix F, the gentleman will find a detailed estimate "for pay of the Navy, an estimate of the amount required to pay



officers of the United States Navy on the active list for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," and it is continued for several pages.

Mr. MOORE. Is there anything in that statement which indicates how much money is paid to the retired officers and the officers on the active list?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it shows the pay for active officers, and also at the various navy yards. I have not gone through it in detail.

Mr. MOORE. I do not wish to put the gentleman to any inconvenience, or to take up his time. The point is, is there any method by which Congress receives information as to the amount of money provided for in this bill that goes to the retired officers of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; on page 25 of the bill the gentleman will find pay and allowances of the officers on the retired list.

Mr. MOORE. What is the total amount?

Mr. PADGETT. Three million seventy thousand two hundred and thirty dollars.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. How many of these Books of Estimates are sent to Congress, and are they for general distribution?

Mr. PADGETT. They are for general distribution, and are distributed through the document room.

Mr. SLOAN. How many are provided?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know; there is an ample number. The gentleman can get them by applying to the document room.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. I understood the gentleman to say, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], that the total annual expense for the officers on the retired list was over \$3,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Three million seventy thousand two hundred and thirty dollars is the amount carried in the present bill.

Mr. BORLAND. That is the annual expense?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How does that compare with the amount that other nations expend for officers on the retired list?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I could not say exactly as to other nations, but it is much higher. The pay on the active list and the pay on the retired list is higher in the United States than in any foreign country. In all foreign countries except England they have conscription both in the army and in the navy.

Mr. BORLAND. England is the only country that relies on volunteer enlistment, as we do?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. England carries a retired pay of considerable size?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but her active and retired pay are both lower than in the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. England's Navy is much larger than ours—practically double, is it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And the gentleman says our expense for officers on the retired list is larger than England's?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the totals. I am talking relatively. In other words, the allowance we make to officers on the retired list is greater than the allowance England makes. What the total is I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has not the total. Is that to be found in any figures in the report?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I have not got it in my report. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a statement for the benefit of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked as to what would be the course of procedure to-day—about how long we would continue in session. I will say that it is my desire to run until about 6 o'clock, but not to hold a night session. There were some Members who wanted to know whether there would be a night session. It is not my purpose to ask for a night session, but I would be glad to continue until 6 o'clock.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, we have been holding pretty long hours this week, and 6 o'clock is pretty late. Would it not depend upon the progress that we make with the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. If we can make first-class progress, we may get some time off that, but I would be very glad to run until 6 o'clock, if we can, but I shall not ask for a night session.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede to all men on this floor equal love of country and equal patriotism, but I also note on this question, as on most all other big questions, a diversity of opinion.

But, may I make this suggestion? I believe that the duties of a Member of Congress can be summed up in this one statement: That while serving in this capacity we are the guardians of the people's liberties, prosperity, and peace, and that the greatest of these is peace.

I believe that if President Wilson has done nothing else or shall do nothing else than to successfully steer the ship of state off the rocks of war, and thereby preserve the peace of our people, he will be entitled to have erected to his memory a monument towering toward the skies, bearing this inscription: "First in peace, always in peace, and forever in the hearts of his countrymen."

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that we all earnestly desire peace, but differ only in the mode of preserving it. I am quite willing to concede to the "big Navy" advocates absolute sincerity of purpose; that they honestly believe that the best way—in fact, the only way—to successfully maintain peace with the other nations of the earth is to have a Navy big enough to blow them off the face of the earth if they do not remain steadfastly our friends. To this barbarous doctrine every fiber of my being dissents. I believe that such an idea is not only immoral, but fraught with great danger to the peace of the world.

You can not long keep a man your friend through fear, but you can make him your friend throughout time and eternity by kindness, which will ripen into love.

Mr. Chairman, I have walked up and down Pennsylvania Avenue, this city, with impunity and in absolute security for 10 years. Why? Not because all the savage instincts of man have disappeared—for if so, we would not now have any advocates of a big navy with us—but because I went about my business showing no disposition to interfere with the rights and liberties of any other man. But I apprehend that if I were to have donned a sombrero with a rattlesnake band on it, my trousers tucked in my boot tops, a red bandana handkerchief tied around my neck and a six-shooter buckled around me and a cigar in my mouth elevated at an angle of 45° and started down the Avenue that I would have been lucky to have got as far as Seventh Street before I would have found trouble with some fellow. Nations are not unlike individuals, for a nation is simply an aggregation of individuals. If a nation dons its war paint and buckles on 60 or 70 big battleships, with 40 or 50 submarines concealed in its bootlegs, and starts strutting out over the ocean highways, it is almost sure to run amuck with the inevitable result that that nation is instantly compelled to offer thousands of its best young men upon the altar as a sacrifice to the gods of war. Mr. Chairman, if I had a thousand boys, not one of them would enter the Army or Navy if I could prevent it in any way except as a volunteer citizen soldier, and only then to fight in the defense of their homes and their liberties.

It is a lamentable fact that as soon as the average man puts on the uniform, especially if he happens to be decorated with the insignia of an officer, he immediately conceives a supreme contempt for the civil authority. Ah! More still. His moral ideas seem to undergo a radical change. I fear it is too often true that the lesson of love for his God and his fellow man, lessons which he learned at his mother's knee, is forgotten, and not only that, but he seems to forget his God and learns to hate his fellow man. Do you say that I have put it too strongly? I would only be glad to know that I had, but I fear that I have not. There came to my desk yesterday, and I presume others received it, a pamphlet prepared by Dr. William White, the emeritus professor of surgery in the University of Pennsylvania. In that document I find extracts from the writings of an eminent military man, a citizen of one of the countries now engaged in the terrible war raging in Europe. It is surely the creed of the devotees of the mistaken doctrine of "preparedness." One can scarcely believe that in this age of civilization such astounding and iconoclastic statements could find utterance anywhere, but after all we can not deny that they are but the actions of the militarist expressed in words. Let me read you some of them:

#### A WAR PRIMER FOR AMERICANS.

Self-preservation is the State's highest ideal and justifies whatever action it may take if that action be conducive to that end. The State is the sole judge of the morality of its action. It is, in fact, above morality, or, in other words, whatever is necessary is moral.

Any nation in favor of collective humanity outside the limits of the State and nationality is impossible.

War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which can not be dispensed with, since with-



out it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization.

Just as increase of population forms under certain circumstances a convincing argument for war, so industrial conditions may compel the same result.

We can, fortunately, assert the impossibility of efforts after peace ever attaining their ultimate object in a world bristling with arms, where a healthy egoism still directs the policy of most countries.

We ought to know that there is no such thing as eternal peace.

War is in itself a good thing. It is a biological necessity of the first importance.

The inevitableness, the idealism, the blessing of war as an indispensable and stimulating law of development must be repeatedly emphasized.

War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power. Efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental as soon as they can influence politics.

Efforts directed toward the abolition of war are not only foolish but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race.

Efforts for peace would, if they attained their goal, lead to general degeneration, as happens everywhere in nature where the struggle for existence is eliminated.

Huge armaments are in themselves desirable. They are the most necessary precondition of our national health.

The State's highest moral duty is to increase its power.

The State is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few minutes, but I will yield for just a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman whether in view of the notice that has been served on the State Department he thinks the shipping bill is a measure that is steering toward peace?

Mr. HAMLIN. I think it is. I see nothing to the contrary.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did we not have a war with Mexico last year?

Mr. HAMLIN. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. I think history will put it down as a war.

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not think that the gentleman will conclude that the little skirmish at Vera Cruz amounted to a war.

Mr. BUTLER. Where we seized a port of a friendly nation?

Mr. HAMLIN. And then voluntarily withdrew.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman tell us who the author is from whom he is reading?

Mr. HAMLIN. I have just stated that I am reading from a pamphlet prepared by Dr. J. William White, professor emeritus of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GARDNER. But who is the author he is quoting there?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman can consult the document.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman from Missouri will state that the gentleman from Massachusetts can consult the document, and from that can obtain the information which he desires.

Mr. GARDNER. Why does the gentleman conceal that information from the House at this time?

Mr. HAMLIN. Under the circumstances the gentleman from Missouri feels that it would perhaps be the best thing not to state the name of the author.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the name of the author Treitschke?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman can consult the document.

Mr. GARDNER. In other words, he is reading from a German author?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield further. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to say just at this point—and I am not going to object—that Dr. J. William White, whom the gentleman quotes, is one of the most eminent physicians in this country, but he has written a book on just one side of the question.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am neither indorsing nor condemning Dr. J. William White's opinions.

Mr. MOORE. I merely wanted to state that in fairness to the gentleman.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am only reading extracts from writings of his, in which he makes certain quotations.

Mr. Chairman, I am for peace, and I do not believe that the best way to secure and maintain peace is to prepare for war. Preparedness precipitates war. The so-called "small Navy" advocates are not alone in that opinion. There reached me

through the mail, from what source I do not know, a document entitled "Austrian and Hungarian Notabilities on the War."

In this document I find an open letter to one of our colleagues, Mr. BARTHOLDT, from Missouri. This letter seems to have been written by the very eminent Baron Ernest von Plener, a member of the Austrian House of Lords. The following is a quotation from his letter:

OPEN LETTER TO MR. BARTHOLDT FROM BARON ERNEST VON PLENER, MEMBER OF THE AUSTRIAN HOUSE OF LORDS, OF THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION COURT.

DEAR MR. BARTHOLDT: As an old colleague of yours in the Council of the Interparliamentary Union, I have always highly appreciated your fair judgment and your impartial views; therefore I take the liberty to address to you a few remarks on the origin and real scope of the present war.

The English ministers and newspapers pretend that this war is a necessity and a justified necessity, for it is waged, they say, to put down the intolerable militarism of Germany, which, according to their opinion, is a standing menace to civilization, democracy, and the peace of the world. Now, let us look at the facts, and let us examine whether this war was really brought about by the military policy of Germany or whether the armaments of Germany and Austria-Hungary were not rather provoked by the aggressive military measures of Russia, France, and England.

Since the Morocco crisis the armaments of all European powers were increasing. The annual military expenditure rises in the years from 1908 to 1912 in all States by a little more than 20 per cent; the naval estimates of England rose in that period from 32.3 million pounds to 51.6 million pounds, or more than 50 per cent. The annual levy of recruits in France rose from 248,503 in 1906 to 276,000 in 1910-11, the rank and file of the French Army from 563,000 to 602,766 men, whereas Germany, with a much larger population, did not increase the peace footing of her army. The closer diplomatic connection between France and Russia brought on a positive agreement between the general staffs of the two armies, the purport of which far exceeded the terms of a mere political alliance. England drew the threads between the two allied powers tighter and tighter, and with the increase of her fleet the fighting power of the triple entente surpassed already then that of the triple alliance. In 1912 a new start in the armaments began. In Russia an extraordinary military credit of 1,350,000,000 rubles besides the regular estimates was passed by the Duma, which in the next year voted a supplementary extraordinary credit of 222,000,000 rubles. During the Balkan war Russia began the so-called trial mobilizations, retaining the men of the reserve force much longer in the front and thus increasing the rank and file of her army. The Balkan war had shifted still more the military balance, as the Balkan States, which mostly sided with the triple entente, came out with greater armies. Under these circumstances Austria-Hungary was obliged to increase her annual number of recruits for the common army from 103,100 to 159,500 men, bringing the peace footing from 293,800 to 344,000 men; a comparatively small increase of both landwehrs was a consequence of this measure. Germany, whose army counted in 1911 only 515,321 and in 1912 544,211 men (without officers and noncommissioned officers), could neither be indifferent to Russian armaments, so she raised it in 1913 to 661,176 men. Then followed France, who, under the avowed pressure of Russia, reintroduced the three-years' service and brought her rank and file by this measure to 734,292. Russia continued the system of trial mobilization, prolonging thereby the active service by four till five months, and since 1912 she retained the whole class, which ought to have been discharged, so that her peace strength rose from 1,520,000 to 1,820,000 men. Austria-Hungary, against whom these menacing forces were chiefly directed, increased in the spring of 1914 her levy for the common army by 5,600 men, and for the both landwehrs accordingly, a trifle in comparison with the Russian armaments.

Can anyone with these facts before him reasonably pretend that Germany is the moving agent of militarism in Europe? It was, on the contrary, the clear design of the triple entente to organize and increase her forces, so that they might eventually be superior to those of Germany and Austria-Hungary. It was England who, by her reckless building of battleships, stretched to the utmost the military and naval exertion of all the other States and so prepared the war.

Mr. Chairman, you will observe that he is endeavoring to place the blame on some other nation rather than his own for setting all Europe on fire.

Naturally none of the nations now engaged in that war wants to take the responsibility for that inhuman slaughter. But I especially call your attention to the causes which he says led up to that terrible war. He outlines, by giving the figures, the shameful race of the nations over there in preparing for war by increasing the number of men in their armies—men who were to be the victims to be offered as a sacrifice to the unholy god of war. But note what he says anent the building of battleships:

It was England who by her reckless building of battleships stretched to the utmost the military and naval exertion of all other States, and so prepared the war.

May we not take a lesson from this? We all agree that we want peace; then let us prepare for peace, and not war. Let us quit playing the "tumble bug," by looking one way and pushing the other.

We are about to authorize this year the building of two additional battleships, at a cost to the people of about \$35,000,000. Can we justify this expenditure of the public money at this time? I do not believe that we can.

How much more glorious and Christlike it would be, while the world stands appalled at the fearful slaughter of human beings in Europe, if this Nation, instead of building great battleships, would lead the world back to the paths of peace and



to the principle taught by the Prince of Peace. This I conceive to be both our mission and our duty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman from Missouri is going to talk that way, I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to continue—

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman will print in the RECORD—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order. Courtesy is wasted on the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman to order; he is talking without recognition.

Mr. MANN. So is the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers while traveling under orders in the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for actual and necessary traveling expenses of midshipmen while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, including the rental of offices in the District of Columbia; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks' and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; stationery and recording; religious books; expenses of purchasing paymasters' offices of the various cities, including clerks, furniture, fuel, stationery, and incidental expenses; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service (hereafter subscriptions may be paid for in advance); all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; care of library, including the purchase of books, photographs, prints, manuscripts, and periodicals; ferrage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés; information from abroad, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams, cablegrams, and postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and purchasing pay offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed \$200,000; in all, \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That the laws relating to annual leave contained in section 7 of the legislative act approved March 15, 1898, and the deficiency act approved July 7, 1898, shall hereafter apply to classified civil-service per diem employees of the clerical, drafting, inspection, chemical, messenger, and watch forces at navy yards, naval stations, offices of the United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material, offices of superintending naval constructors, and other offices and stations under the Navy Department.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Beginning in line 16?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Beginning line 16, page 3, and ending with line 2, page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I concede it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I still reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order to the entire paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. I request the gentleman not to insist upon the point of order against this proviso, because that prevents a discussion which might show that there is great merit in the proposition.

The "per diem" employees are treated differently from other employees of the naval service with respect to leave. It is now useless to argue their case here, but in fairness to them I submit the following statement from some of my Philadelphia constituents:

In this connection it is stated that there are approximately 2,600 members of the clerical, drafting, inspection, chemical, messenger, and watch forces at the various navy yards and naval stations in the United States. These employees are members of the same group of the classified civil service as employees of the various legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Government. They are required to conform to the same entrance-examination conditions, secure the same percentage from the examination in order to be placed upon the eligible list, and are subject to the same rules and regulations. In every respect they have exactly the same status as other members of the classified service, and yet they receive only 15 days' annual leave, while all other employees get 30.

At the present time employees are rated either per annum or per diem employees. The per annum employees receive 30 days' annual leave, while the per diem employees receive 15 days' leave. There are stationed at the various navy yards, inspection offices, and naval stations employees working side by side who are rated as per annum and per diem employees. The expression "per diem" is simply a measure of pay and not of employment. As an illustration, a per diem employee at the Navy Department would receive 30 days' leave, or, in other words, the same consideration as a per annum employee, but if that same employee were transferred to a navy yard, naval station, or other office under the Navy Department, he would receive only 15 days' leave.

It is evident from the above that employees of the same rating, doing the same kind of work, subject to the same rules and regulations, and under the same employer, are entitled to the same treatment in all respects, and at present the technical differences between per annum and per diem employers enables one group to receive 30 days' leave and the other 15. If the clause of the naval bill quoted above is passed by Congress, the inequality of treatment of employees described above will be eliminated.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not in order, as the gentleman from Illinois has reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] took the floor and made a beautiful oration upon peace. I do not think there is any division in this House represented by that aisle upon the question of peace. So far as the President stands for neutrality, he has the undivided support of the American people and of the Representatives in this House; but the question I want to call attention to for a moment is that this morning, according to the press reports, we are notified by Sir Edward Grey that any attempt to buy interned vessels would be considered an unneutral act, and that that notice has been in the State Department for 10 days. Why has that information been kept from the public when the very question was being discussed—

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I will not yield.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman mean to say the State Department should make public all the information it has?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. Well, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman want to continue with this naval bill, or does he want to start some trouble?

Mr. BORLAND. I want the gentleman either to discuss the bill or permit a question.

Mr. MANN. Or let somebody else make his speech, and we are not going to have that.

Mr. BORLAND. Then, the gentleman can discuss the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order there is no quorum if the gentleman is going to have to yield to some one to make some other gentleman's speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman from Missouri a moment ago spoke for 10 minutes—

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order the gentleman is not confining his remarks to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes the point of order of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And you may have to keep one here the rest of the time you are discussing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). Eighty-four gentlemen are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adamson	Cantor	Eagle	Gudger
Aiken	Cantrill	Edwards	Hamill
Alney	Carew	Elder	Hamilton, Mich.
Anthony	Carlin	Fairchild	Hamilton, N. Y.
Avis	Carter	Falcon	Hart
Baker	Cary	Falconer	Helvering
Barchfeld	Clancy	Farr	Hill
Bartholdt	Claypool	Ferris	Hinebaugh
Bartlett	Collier	Finley	Holland
Beall, Tex.	Copley	Floyd	Howard
Borland	Crosser	Francis	Hoxworth
Britten	Dale	Gallagher	Igoe
Brodbeck	Davenport	George	Jones
Brown, N. Y.	Davis	Gill	Keister
Brown, W. Va.	Defenderfer	Goodwin	Kelly, Pa.
Bruckner	Donohoe	Goulden	Kennedy, Iowa
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Graham, Ill.	Kent
Bulkley	Doolling	Graham, Pa.	Kindel
Burke, Pa.	Doremus	Green, Iowa	Kitchin
Byrnes, S. C.	Doughton	Gregg	Korby
Calder	Driscoll	Griest	Kreider
Campbell	Dunn	Griffin	La Follette



Langham	Mondell	Prouty	Taggart
Langley	Morgan, La.	Ragsdale	Talbot Md.
Lee, Ga.	Morrison	Rauch	Talcott, N. Y.
L'Engle	Moss, Ind.	Riordan	Taylor, N. Y.
Levy	Mott	Roberts, Nev.	Townsend
Lewis, Pa.	Murdock	Rupley	Treadway
Lindbergh	Nelson	Sabath	Underhill
Lindquist	O'Brien	Scully	Vare
Linthicum	Oglesby	Sells	Volstead
Lobeck	O'Shaunessy	Sherwood	Walsh
Loft	Paige, Mass.	Shreve	Whitacre
Logue	Patton, Pa.	Small	White
McGuire, Okla.	Peterson	Smith, Idaho	Wilson, Fla.
Mahan	Platt	Smith, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Maher	Pou	Smith, Saml. W.	Winslow
Metz	Price	Stanley	Woodruff.

Thereupon the committee rose; and Mr. UNDERWOOD, having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, reported that that committee, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, when 272 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and that he presented therewith the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in reference to the matter of subscription. I have no objection to authorizing subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals to be paid in advance. It says:

Newspapers and periodicals for the naval service (hereafter subscriptions may be paid for in advance).

I would like to know how it will be possible for anybody who is printing a volume of the Revised Statutes, bringing the permanent law down to date, to put that in. If you put in the law that subscriptions may be paid for in advance, of course that would be repealing the existing law and allow anything. If you want to identify what is intended, then you have to copy two pages of an appropriation bill. Now, I make a suggestion to the gentleman—this being subject to a point of order—that he strike out there, if he wants to make this paragraph law, and put it in form at the end of the paragraph that “hereafter subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals for the naval service may be paid for in advance out of appropriations made for such purposes.” Then one would know what it means.

Mr. PADGETT. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order. Will the gentleman from Tennessee offer an amendment? I want to make a point of order on the language on page 2, lines 21 and 22, which reads:

Hereafter subscriptions may be paid for in advance.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the paragraph the following: “Hereafter subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals for the naval service may be paid for in advance out of appropriations made for such purpose.”

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me say to the gentleman this is only for official purposes, and under the ruling of the comptroller they can not be paid for.

Mr. COX. I think there is enough regular law in the naval appropriation bill. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, in the confusion a few moments ago I do not know whether I was granted leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not. The gentleman from Massachusetts objected.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing some certain data that I was proceeding to read, and also some other data in regard to preparedness for war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

There shall be a chief of naval operations who shall be an officer on the active list of the Navy not below the grade of rear admiral, appointed for a term of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who, under the Secretary of the Navy, shall be responsible for the readiness of the Navy for war and be charged with its general direction. All orders issued by the chief of naval operations in performing the duties assigned him shall be per-

formed under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary and shall have full force and effect as such. To assist the chief of naval operations in preparing general and detailed plans of war there shall be assigned for this exclusive duty not less than 15 officers of and above the rank of lieutenant commander of the Navy or major of the Marine Corps.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I concede it.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order very briefly.

Mr. HOBSON. I only desire to discuss it briefly, under the principle of the Holman rule. I will not make an extended statement, but I desire to call the Chairman's attention to the fact that this paragraph itself does not involve any expenditure, and, second, that its effect would be to very materially reduce the expenses of the Government under the present bill and under all future bills, and would enable a return to the Treasury of larger unexpended balances than have ever been so returned.

Now, there is nothing so wasteful as inefficiency. There is nothing so economical as efficiency, and with a given provision for naval or military status the injection of improved efficiency, for any part of the establishment will of necessity result in economy of the operations in that part.

Now, to illustrate this concretely. I think the words of the president of the Navy War College would be more to the point than my own words, and I will read these for the Chairman's benefit. They occurred in an address delivered by the president of the War College of the Navy a few days ago before the Efficiency Club of New York, and it dealt with the question of efficiency in the Navy:

He said:

It is not my intention to go into questions of the efficiency of individual ships, the results of target practice, and kindred topics. I propose to deal with the efficiency of the Navy as a whole, considering it as a great and very complicated machine, upon which hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended, with one end in view, and only one—the development of a supremely efficient weapon for the defense of the country against any and every enemy which may come against us. I was asked a few weeks ago what the War College considered that the fleet should do, and I replied:

“The War College considers that every effort of the fleet and every effort of the department in connection with the fleet should have for its sole aim the war efficiency of the fleet. Every effort which does not directly contribute to this end is in itself a wasteful expenditure of energy, and, so far as it is a diversion from this end, is distinctly harmful.”

Now, Mr. Chairman, he then proceeds:

I am not one of those who hold that it is altogether inefficient. Unsatisfactory as conditions are, it would be very easy to exaggerate them. When things are wrong you can always find extremists to tell you that they are much worse than they actually are. Some people think that this is the only way to make an impression. Others are so constituted temperamentally that they can see nothing good in anything which falls short of perfection as they see it.

There is much about the Navy which is splendidly efficient, but as a whole it is far less efficient than it can and ought to be. Our ships are fine. Our officers are capable, industrious, and ambitious. Our enlisted men are the equals of those in other navies. But efficient ships and officers and men do not alone make an efficient Navy. They must be welded into an efficient whole by a unity of organization and administration and purpose which coordinates their capabilities and directs their efforts toward a common end, wisely selected and very clearly seen. Here is the first point at which we are lacking.

Now, I do not desire to detain the Chair too long; but I wish to read further his specifications very briefly. I read:

I come now to what is perhaps the most important part of my subject—the organization of the Navy Department, viewed from the standpoint of efficiency. There can be no question that the existing organization is inadequate and would break down under the strain of war.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order at all. He is discussing the merits of the proposition.

Mr. HOBSON. I am leading up to it directly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has been a long time leading and has not reached it yet; and therefore I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. I only ask the courtesy of the Chair, and I submit I am speaking to the Holman rule. That provision, in the first place, insures to the Treasury a larger unexpended balance than would be returned without it, and therefore it would result in a direct saving to the Government. But I can



not explain that in two minutes, since it involves the question of the efficiency of the whole organization.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that unless he can show that a reduction of this expenditure appears as a necessary result from this provision in the bill, it would not come within the terms of the rule, notwithstanding some statement of opinion by somebody or by the gentleman himself. Even if the Chair himself believed that it would eventually reduce expenditures, yet that would not be sufficient, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. HOBSON. Suppose I could demonstrate that the operation of the Navy as a whole during the fiscal year provided for by this bill would be made more efficient, so that some of the activities required to be paid for would be found unnecessary and left out; if I could show that the efficiency of the naval service would be materially increased, would the Chair then consider the question of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not. The Chair will read the Holman rule to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. I have just read it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. If the gentleman has read the Holman rule and understands the Holman rule, he must understand that the paragraph is undoubtedly subject to a point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair excuse me once more? Has the Chair taken account of the question of the return to the Treasury of unexpended balances carried in the bill, and the fact that those are returned? Our present fiscal year will end by a return to the Treasury of more than \$2,000,000, as I understand it, of unexpended balances from the operations of the previous year.

Now, if an amendment could be provided in the bill which would insure that under the operations during the fiscal year, under a greater efficiency, there would be a larger return to the Treasury of unexpended balances, would not that be exactly the equivalent, Mr. Chairman, of an amendment which would reduce expenditures? You might not be able to specify how much it would reduce in any particular paragraph the expenditures appropriated for in the bill itself, but—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD an account of the first battle between ironclads.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an account of the first battle between ironclads. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, what is this copied from?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. From the Vicksburg Herald. The editor of the paper is Capt. D. S. McNeely.

Mr. MANN. Is it original matter, or is it copied from some book?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It is an article written for the Vicksburg Herald. Of course, there are a number of extracts and quotations made from different records.

Mr. MANN. How long is it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I think it would make about two columns in a newspaper.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Navy: For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the Navy Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, \$46,000: *Provided*, That the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow in the settlement of accounts of disbursing officers involved payments made under the appropriation "Contingent, Navy," to civilian employees appointed by the Navy Department for duty in and serving at naval stations maintained in the island possessions during the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] what is the object of continuing this proviso from year to year? I understand when

the proviso first went in it was to permit certain accounts to be passed where, under an erroneous conception of the law, services had been rendered.

Mr. PADGETT. I am not able to explain why it has been in the bill in past years. I did not know but the same contingency might arise in the future.

Mr. MANN. Has it been in the bill for years?

Mr. PADGETT. It has been submitted in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; the department frequently gets into the habit of wanting to do these things. I may be entirely mistaken, but I have a definite recollection that we put this in the bill before because they had employed certain civilian employees contrary to law, but in accordance with what they supposed was the law. Is it necessary now to continue that, when they know what the law is?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to answer definitely, but I think it would be safe to keep it in.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I will make the point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes a point of order on the proviso. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps shall be eligible for any shore duty compatible with their rank and grade to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. I will reserve it.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman withhold it for a moment.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will get in later, when we really strike an appropriation.

Mr. DUPRÉ. What I have to say is not exactly applicable to the bill in question, but I think the gentleman from Illinois will be glad to hear it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better wait until another paragraph is read. I make the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman what objection he has to this? We have inserted the word "Hereafter" in order to obviate the necessity of including the language in the bill every year.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to it as a proper thing to do, but I am opposed to sticking in here a whole lot of legislation on this bill, which the committee ought to have reported as legislative propositions and taken up in the regular legislative manner.

Mr. PADGETT. This provision was in the bill last year.

Mr. MANN. Not in this form.

Mr. PADGETT. I know.

Mr. MANN. It was not carried as a proviso. It was in the bill as an annual matter for the current year, using the word "That" in place of the word "Hereafter."

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I move to amend by offering the language in lines 9 to 12, inclusive, leaving out the word "Hereafter" and substituting for it "That."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, after line 8, insert the following:

"That officers who now perform engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps shall be eligible for any shore duty compatible with their rank and grade to which the Secretary of the Navy may assign them."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee the purpose and operation of this. As I understand, it is to permit officers performing engineering duty on shore only and officers of the Construction Corps to be taken away from those duties and assigned to something else?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is subject to a point of order. It is a designation of the duties of these men. In the personnel act of 1899 it was provided that certain officers in the Engineer Corps should do engineering duty on shore alone. Last year we had this language, authorizing them to be detailed to do duty in the navy yards. It is not to take them from the

shore and put them on sea duty, but it is to allow the Secretary to use them in larger duty in the navy yards.

Mr. BORLAND. When they are taken away from the duty which the law specifies, must not their places be supplied by other men?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it just enlarges their duty. For instance, Capt. Burd, one of the most successful managers that we have, a man who has the largest experience in industrial work at the navy yards, has been made the superintendent of the New York Navy Yard under this language that was put in last year. If it were not for that language, he could not be allowed to do that duty, but would perform subordinate duty—some engineering work in the yard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aeronautics: The sum of \$1,000,000 is hereby reappropriated, out of the total unobligated balances of all annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and made available for aeronautics, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling air craft and appurtenances, maintenance of air-craft stations, experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, and such other aeronautical purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not raise the point of order as to the right to make the appropriation, but as to the right to appropriate the total unobligated balances of all annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and to change the purpose for which those appropriations were made. I do not know just what is meant by the term "annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment." All of the appropriations made in this bill are annual appropriations, though many of them are made available until expended, some by the bill and others by the Revised Statutes. Now, the appropriations made last year are for the current fiscal year. A portion of them are made available until expended by the appropriation law, and many of them are made available until expended by the Revised Statutes. But this, if I read it correctly, would make all of the unobligated balances on July 1, to the extent of \$1,000,000, available for a new purpose and change the law by which the money was appropriated for other purposes. I do not wish to take the time to discuss on a point of order the method of picking up a dollar here and a dollar there and a dollar somewhere else, in the form of unobligated balances, in order to make a new appropriation, but it is an abominable method of appropriation. It would take no more money out of the Treasury to appropriate \$1,000,000 directly for the purpose, instead of directing somebody in the Treasury Department to determine what were unobligated balances, which it is impossible to determine for many months and probably years after the expiration of this fiscal year, in order to spend money for some purpose, theoretically but not in fact, because before they will know what the unobligated balances are this fiscal year will have expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. This is for the fiscal year 1914 and not for the present fiscal year, so that there can be no further obligations.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but there can be.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Many of the appropriations in the appropriation law are made available until expended. There are many others for construction work under the general law made available until expended. You can find appropriations in the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1914 that will be a balance on the books 10 years from now.

Mr. PADGETT. I will call attention to the fact that there is a balance for transportation and navigation, \$176,000; construction and repair, \$1,030,000; equipment of vessels, construction and repair, \$433,000; steam machinery, \$446,000; equipment of vessels, steam engineering, \$230,000; equipment of vessels, supplies and accounts, \$110,000; making an aggregate of \$2,427,539.76.

Now, I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy stating that figuring up the accounts that have come in since the report was made—

Mr. MANN. Which shows that this report is inaccurate.

Mr. PADGETT. He states in the report that there will be additional items of more than \$1,800,000 that can safely be reappropriated from these items.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that, but that is not the point.

Mr. PADGETT. They are annual, they are not permanent appropriations.

Mr. MANN. That is not the point. If we start in on a system knowing that in nearly every appropriation there is some money left, to gather up these sums and reappropriate them as balances in the Treasury for different purposes, the Lord himself, with all His wisdom, could not tell where we stand financially at any time. The Navy Department has tried to state what the unobligated balances are, but they will not know until the accounts are all audited.

Mr. PADGETT. They know that there is nothing to reduce it below \$1,800,000.

Mr. MANN. That has nothing to do with the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. The point I make is that this being appropriated for 1914 no further obligations can be placed upon them. Therefore it is money that goes into the Treasury under the law, and can not be used by the department for any purpose except by authority of Congress, and that Congress can give authority to use that money which has not been obligated and can not be obligated under prior legislation; that it is perfectly competent in this bill to appropriate that money, to make it available for this purpose, because it is money in the Treasury which can not be used by the department, because the time for obligating it passed nearly a year ago.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to assume that they can tell what the unobligated balances are. There are certain appropriations which can not be obligated after the close of the fiscal year for which they are made carried in the naval appropriation law, to which reference is made here. There are certain other appropriations which may be obligated until the money is all exhausted. It does not have to be obligated here, you can obligate it next year or the year after. Most of that is provided for in the appropriation law itself, and some apportioned by the Statutes at Large.

Now, under the law there is a provision that these appropriations which are not expended, where they do not remain available made for the fiscal year 1914, shall be covered back into the Treasury and become balances at the end of the year or two years' time from the end of the fiscal year. This committee has no authority to divert these appropriations, which are available until expended, nor has it any authority to change the law which requires that these appropriations shall be covered back into the Treasury in order to appropriate the money for another purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the appropriation is not authorized by law. There is no authority for the Secretary of the Navy to procure, produce, construct, or operate air craft, or to maintain air-craft stations, or to conduct experimental work in the development of aviation for naval purposes, or giving him general authority to spend appropriations for aeronautical purposes, as he may deem proper.

This paragraph proposes to confer on the Secretary of the Navy an authority which he does not have at the present time. I do not believe such authority can be found for the Chair as being possessed by the Secretary of the Navy. I have never known of any legislation which confers on the Secretary of the Navy authority either to establish or to maintain air-craft stations.

This paragraph further proposes to permit him to expend this appropriation as he may deem proper for aeronautical purposes. That is conferring a power that does not now exist.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, just one word to supplement the argument of the gentleman from New York. Perhaps the chairman would like to know what was carried in last year's bill, so far as aviation was concerned. It says:

Aviation experiments: For experimental work and the development of aviation purposes, \$10,000.

I recall distinctly, as does the Chair, that when this proposition was first placed in an appropriation bill it was in this form of language, and it is only for experimental purposes, whereas the clause under consideration provides for a permanent adjunct of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I call attention to the fact that there are two or three other provisions in the current law of last year and the year before. There is a provision in the bill under "Steam engineering" and under "Construction and repair" for air craft. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have just as much right to appropriate this money as we have the right to appropriate any other money. It can not be used for any pur-



pose until it is authorized by Congress, and we can authorize its use for this purpose. If it were for the current year and could be obligated, we would be changing the law, because it would have been appropriated for a certain purpose, and the time had not expired for its use for that purpose; but this being for the fiscal year 1914, which terminated June 30, 1914, and there being no power to obligate this balance, it is money in the Treasury. I call further attention to the fact that we have air craft and we have stations. We have a station at Pensacola, Fla., where it is being maintained. It is in existence and is being maintained under appropriations heretofore made. I do not think that the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The point of order is made by the gentleman from Illinois. It appears that it has heretofore been decided that a reappropriation of an unexpended balance for an object authorized by law may be made on an appropriation bill for a similar object.

On February 12, 1897, the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole when the paragraph was read:

The Postmaster General is authorized to apply to the payment of the salaries of letter carriers for the fiscal year 1897 the sum of \$23,000, being an unexpended balance of \$13,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for street letter boxes, posts, and pedestals, and an unexpended balance of \$9,500 of the appropriation for the current fiscal year for package boxes.

On February 14, 1907, when the naval appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole, this proviso was read:

And provided further, That the unexpended balances under appropriations "Provisions, Navy, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1905 and 1906," are hereby reappropriated for "Provisions, Navy, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1908."

It was held that that was in order; but in this case the reappropriations asked for do not point out from what appropriations this reappropriation is asked, nor the specific amounts; nor does it appear that this appropriation is for a similar object. Therefore, the Chair, differentiating these decisions, which hold that a reappropriation is in order, is constrained to arrive at the conclusion that when the reappropriation is asked for it must specify from what appropriation heretofore made the reappropriation is asked and the specific amounts to be reappropriated. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and does not think it is necessary to pass on the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman an amendment prepared upon this paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has it been carefully prepared?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. Why not pass it over until the gentleman can prepare an amendment carefully?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to pass this provision with the permission to return to it when I can prepare an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to be present at that time. Will it be at the conclusion of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Why not say that it will be when the bill is taken up the next day for consideration?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I simply wish to know in order that I may be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to pass over this subject until the bill is taken upon the first day after this day for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Arming and equipping Naval Militia: For the pay, subsistence, and transportation of such portion of the Naval Militia as shall engage in actual service or instruction afloat or on shore, and for pay, transportation, and subsistence of any part of the Naval Militia as shall participate in any cruise, maneuvers, field instruction, or encampment of any part of the Regular Navy afloat or on shore; for the purpose of providing for issue to the Naval Militia any stores and supplies or publications which are supplied to the Navy by any department; for the actual and necessary traveling expenses, together with a per diem to be established by the Secretary of the Navy, of the Naval Militia Board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy; and for the necessary clerical and office expenses of the Division of Naval Militia Affairs in the office of the Secretary of the Navy, \$250,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. Does not the legislative bill carry the

clerical force of the Division of Naval Affairs in the office of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; not entirely. Under the Naval Militia law in the Sixty-third Congress, a copy of which I have here, on page 7 it provides:

The actual and necessary traveling expenses of the members of such board, together with a per diem, to be established by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be paid to the members of the board. The expenses herein authorized, together with the necessary clerical and office expenses of the Division of the Naval Militia force in the office of the Secretary of the Navy shall constitute a charge against the whole sum annually appropriated under the appropriation for the arming and equipping of the Naval Militia in the annual appropriation for the Navy and shall be paid therefrom.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the date of that act?

Mr. PADGETT. February 16, 1914.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in one respect that act has been modified, and that is by a change in the authorization of a per diem for the members of the Naval Militia Board. Under a more recent law there is a provision which prohibits the payment of more than \$5 a day for actual expenses, although a rate of \$4 a day may be established as a per diem in lieu of actual expenses. Section 13 of the act of August 1, 1914, for the sundry civil expenses of the Government, provides:

That the heads of executive departments and other Government establishments are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence to persons engaged in field work or traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts of duty when not otherwise fixed by law. For the fiscal year 1916 and annually thereafter estimates of appropriations from which per diem allowances are to be paid shall specifically state the rates of such allowances.

I have sent for another act which limits the payment of more than \$5 a day for actual expenses to any person. The provision in this bill permits a per diem to be established by the Secretary of the Navy without limitation. I do not wish to take the whole paragraph out, but I believe the gentleman should modify it to make it conform with the law.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The members of this Naval Militia board should not be allowed any higher per diem than is allowed to an other officer of the Government.

Mr. PADGETT. I am willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, I shall withdraw the point of order and suggest the insertion of an amendment that it be not to exceed \$4 a day, to be established by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Did the gentleman say \$4 or \$5 per day?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Four dollars in lieu of actual subsistence.

Mr. PADGETT. All right; just put it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They can allow them \$5 a day if they return a voucher for their actual expenses, but if they are to be allowed a per diem regardless of vouchers \$4 is the limit.

Mr. PADGETT. All right; just offer the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest to the chairman to insert after the words "per diem," in line 9, the words, "not to exceed \$4," so it will read, "With a per diem not to exceed \$4 to be established by the Secretary of the Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 6, by inserting, after the words "per diem," in line 9, the words "not to exceed \$4."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of the silence of the parliamentary sharks who have been so much in action in the House this morning to ask the House to turn aside for a moment from the bloody naval engagements that we have been fighting here for the last day or two and take notice of the fact that to-day is the seventieth birthday of one of the most distinguished members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, my colleague, Gen. ALBERT ESTOPINAL. [Applause.] I think I voice the sentiment of the House when I steal a clever paraphrase of the toast of Old Rip which I heard the other day and say to the general, "I hope you will live as long as possible." [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Care of lepers, islands of Guam and Cullion: Naval station, island of Guam: Maintenance and care of lepers, special patients, and for other purposes, including cost of transfer of lepers from Guam to the island of Cullion, in the Philippines, and their maintenance, \$14,000.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Will the chairman of the committee advise us what interest the Federal Government has in paying for these lepers?

Mr. PADGETT. These were transferred under provision of law two years ago from Guam to one of the islands over there in the Philippines in order to segregate the lepers and get them away from Guam. They are on the island of Cullion now. The whole expense is paid for under this appropriation, which has been running for a number of years.

Mr. MOORE. Well, do any lepers from the Philippines go to this island?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Has the question been raised as to whether the Philippine Government should pay this cost out of its own funds?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not now.

Mr. MOORE. We hear a great deal about the ability of the Philippine Government to take care of itself in matters of this kind, and it has been frequently commented upon that they receive very little assistance from the United States. May I ask the gentleman whether any other provision of this kind is contained in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; this is all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee; I notice this paragraph proposes to remove some lepers now at Guam.

Mr. PADGETT. They have been removed. This is language that was in the bill in order to take care of it if additional cases should arise, and the original language in the bill of several years ago is preserved. It was to free the island of Guam from lepers and place them at Cullion instead of having a portion of them in one place and a portion in another.

Mr. MILLER. It is entirely proper, but I was wondering if there were any lepers remaining in Guam in any considerable number?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any, but they have had them there for centuries, and a case might develop now and then.

Mr. MILLER. I will state to the gentleman I was there about a year ago, and at that time I was informed that the lepers had practically all been removed, but under this phraseology I thought it contemplated to remove some more.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand they have been removed, but if a case should arise they ought to have the power of dealing with it.

Mr. MILLER. One further inquiry. The amount appropriated herein is \$14,000. Can the gentleman inform us how many lepers from Guam are now at Cullion?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. That was disposed of several years ago, as I stated, and this amount is to take care of all the lepers confined at one place.

Mr. MILLER. Is there a separate account kept as to the expenses of caring for the lepers from Guam who are now at Cullion?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not answer.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, the Philippine Government makes quite an extensive appropriation for the care of lepers at the Cullion colony, and if we have transported some from Guam there, of course we ought to pay for them; but I was wondering if a separate account is kept or whether we gave a lump sum and they used so much for the care of the Guam lepers.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say, but I do not think it is turned over in a lump sum. I think it is distributed in looking after and caring for the lepers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recruiting: Expenses of recruiting for the naval service; rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties, \$130,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the naval service shall be expended in recruiting seamen, ordinary seamen, or apprentice seamen unless, in case of minors, a certificate of birth or a verified written statement by the parents, or either of them, or in case of their death a verified written statement by the legal guardian, be first furnished to the recruiting officer, showing applicant to be of age required by naval regulations, which shall be presented with the application for enlistment; except in cases where such certificate is unobtainable, enlistment may be made when the recruiting officer is convinced that oath of applicant as to age is credible; but when it is afterwards found, upon evidence satisfactory to the Navy Department, that recruit has sworn falsely as to age, and is under 18 years of age at the time of enlistment, he shall, upon request of either parent, or, in case of their death, by the legal guardian, be released from service in the Navy upon payment of full cost of first outfit, unless in any given case the Secretary, in his discretion, shall relieve said recruit of such payment: *Provided*, That authority is hereby granted to employ the services of an advertising agency or agencies in advertising for recruits under such terms and conditions as are most advantageous to the Government.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not offer an amendment until the point of order is disposed of. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I do not make it, but I would like to have an explanation of this advertising proviso. Many lurid advertisements are posted in the cities. They are in the nature of inducements to young men to join the Navy for the purpose of seeing the world. The descriptive statements are very attractive and tend to lead young men to enlist because of the fraternal features of the service. I fear from requests that come along later asking for releases from the Navy that these highly colored advertisements may be overdrawn. I would like to ask the chairman's view of the matter.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there has been much of that to speak of in late years, and the Secretary has instituted a new policy, and whenever a man is dissatisfied in the Navy, instead of having to desert or run away he just lets him out. They have a waiting list for the Navy and have no trouble in keeping up recruits, and there is no trouble and no necessity for inducing the young men by any methods such as you have described.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman tell us how much money is spent in advertising?

Mr. PADGETT. It is \$14,519.39—a small amount.

Mr. MOORE. Does the proviso which precedes the advertising paragraph liberalize the department's treatment of the boys who enlist under age?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been the law for a number of years; and this year, instead of repeating the law as we have been doing, and as it has received the approval of the House a number of times, and instead of making it a limitation upon this bill and repeating it every year, we have made that the law, and thought we would just take it out without having to repeat it every year.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman does not think, then, that the advertising for boys to enlist in the Navy has resulted in any abuse?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the last proviso. I have had enough trouble in regard to that in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, at end of line 11, add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used to pay for the printing, publishing, or circulating of posters, papers, or literature of any kind that in any respect gives misinformation as to the character of the service to be performed by men enlisted for service in the Navy or Marine Corps, or that is calculated to deceive men who apply for enlistment, or whose enlistment is sought by recruiting officers, as to the character of the service to be performed, the opportunities thereof, or advantage to be derived therefrom."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the point of order was sustained to the proviso ending on line 14, I would ask unanimous consent that the amendment I offer be put in the proper place—at the end of line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. Having stricken out the whole subject of advertising, the matter is not in the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The money to be used to carry on the recruiting service is not used altogether in advertising, or the printing and publishing of posters and literature of other kinds; it is not all paid to advertising agencies. Some advertising is done by and under the direction of the department itself, and my amendment is aimed at the correction of abuses by the department. It seems to me that the point of order is not good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is in order in the paragraph as to expenses for recruiting for the Naval Service. Now, this is simply a limitation on the expenditure of this appropriation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for five minutes on his amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the answer made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], the chairman of the committee, to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] as to the character



of posters, literature, papers, and so on, printed by or under the direction of the Navy Department, and the methods employed by that department to secure enlistments. Every one of us has seen the great flaring posters, advertising in an attractive way, the Naval Service, and he knows they are calculated to deceive. Other papers and letters are issued by the department, or some agency employed by it, and some of them are calculated to deceive. They give misinformation as to the character of the service, its opportunities, and the advantages to be enjoyed by young men who engage in it. It seems to me the department can not be too careful in representations it makes to young men whom it would engage in its service. I venture to say there is not a Member on this floor but has had experience with the Navy Department in the matter of discipline imposed upon some young man from his district or in the matter of a desertion from the Navy, and he has learned that the young man enlisted on account of misrepresentation made to him by a recruiting officer or on account of a misunderstanding he received from posters or literature issued by or under the direction of the Navy Department. It is well known that enlistments about a year ago were obtained, a large number of them, I understand, by promises by the department, or by its authority, that foreign voyages would be taken, that enlisted men would have opportunity and advantage of visiting foreign countries, and when the men were enlisted and entered the service they found that no such voyages were even contemplated by the department. And so much trouble arose on account of those misrepresentations, or the subsequent attitude of the department, that some voyages were arranged and carried out.

Now, I insist that the department can not be too careful in the representations it makes, and in its methods and means of securing enlistments. A recruiting officer comes to a town and perhaps the first opportunity the boys there have ever had for coming in contact with a representative of the Government is then given them; they rely upon the representations he makes, and a deep and very unfavorable impression is made upon the youth of the country if his statements are false, or if the alluring advertisements which he displays are calculated to give a wrong impression of the service. Every one of them, or many of them, are actually false or misleading on their face. A boy is attracted, is unduly influenced by statements of the recruiting officer and by his beautiful pictures and alluring literature. He enters the service which he is led to believe offers great advantages and opportunities. Later he finds the service difficult and the discipline very severe, with few, if any, opportunities or advantages, such as he was led to believe he would enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes longer. I may not use it all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Further, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, that young men may not find the service as attractive as they thought it was, and instead of deserting they are now permitted quietly and without trouble to retire, I wish to say that I think the gentleman overstates the situation. I know of a case where a young man on leave from his ship overstayed his time, and, on account of the experience he had on the ship, or on account of the severe discipline he had seen imposed in similar trifling cases, he was afraid to return. He remained away for a few days and communicated with his family and with me. I brought that matter to the attention of the Navy Department and offered to return the young man to his service, and he did voluntarily return. Some time elapsed before there was a trial, following an investigation of his case—perhaps several weeks—and when he was permitted to retire—permitted, as the gentleman from Tennessee says—it was on condition that his parents pay a large sum of money, an outrageous sum, it seems to me, to cover the expense, as it was called, of his outfit when he first enlisted. And added to that outrageous amount he was compelled to reimburse the Government by paying an additional sum; that is, the money he would have received from the time he left the ship until the end of the term of imprisonment—the entire pay that he might have received—not the money he did receive, but the money he would have received if he had not absented himself and remained away from his ship. And besides the money he was compelled to pay he was imprisoned 30 days.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is also aware, no doubt, that there are some cases where they are not even permitted to buy their way out under those conditions, especially cases where they have had somewhat of the benefit of the trade schools that have been established. I have in mind a case where a boy completed his first period of service and at the beginning of the second period received some of this benefit and became a coppersmith, and served part of his second year, and although his family needed his services to save their property they can not get him out even by buying.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes. Wrongs are committed that are difficult to characterize. There are wrongs in the system that exists in that department, and the young men are not properly treated. They are induced to enlist on account of misrepresentations made to them, and I am inclined to believe that the discipline is far too severe upon boys who come from patriotic homes to serve their country and, if necessity arises, to offer their lives in its defense.

I say these boys come from the patriotic homes of the country. Some of them are induced to leave school or to give up profitable employment. They are boys from our homes, accustomed to proper and considerate treatment; they are not tramps or outcasts of society, accustomed to the frowns and kicks and cuffs of those with whom they come in contact. They offer their services to their country, willing to do their duty, and in case of war—and service in war is always a possibility to those who enter the Navy—they are willing to offer their lives for the flag under which they enlist. The boys who are enlisting in the Navy are a credit to the service and to the country. They ought not to be deceived in order to induce them to enlist, and after enlistment they ought to be treated considerately and justly, consistent with proper and effective discipline, which discipline every intelligent man knows must be strict, and in some cases severe. If they are guilty of violating the regulations of the service; if, as in the case I have stated, they do not report for duty promptly after leave of absence; or, if by mishap they actually desert from the service, the punishment meted out to them and the treatment they receive ought not to be unnecessarily severe. In my judgment, the discipline and the punishment are in some cases too severe. In some cases called to my attention it is outrageous, and I am offering this amendment and calling the attention of the House and of the department to it with the hope that conditions may be radically changed and the objectionable features of the service as it relates to enlistment and service of the boys removed.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman know of any general complaint being made by the boys in the Navy, or is it just an isolated case now and then?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not know how general the complaint is, but I was informed that the punishment imposed upon the young man I speak of and the money demands that were made upon him or upon his parents as a condition of his release from the service was the usual punishment and the usual money demand inflicted and imposed upon a boy who gets into the unfortunate condition in which this young man found himself as a result of carelessness, certainly without wrong intention. I believe these regulations, if they are general, are wrong and ought to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, everybody agrees that false representations should not be made about anything. Certainly they ought not to be made about enlistment in either the Army or the Navy.

I do not agree entirely with the gentleman touching the situation. I have had a great many cases that came up, because I represent a city in which there is a very active recruiting both in the Army and in the Navy, and frequently the complaint of the boy has no basis in fact. Very frequently the young fellow happens to be out of a job or happens to be getting over a spree, and he concludes he will go into the Army or the Navy, without having seriously considered what it means. He gets in there and finds that he is required to do a day's work for a day's pay and to obey orders.

You will never have any army or navy fit to call by the name where a man is not required to obey orders. And then these young men either get homesick or they dislike the discipline or the change from their former free and easy life, and the first thing you know a request is made upon their Congressmen to get them a discharge. It is surprising the amount of sickness that gets into a boy's family the moment a boy

enlists in the service, wants to get out, and it is surprising the number of other reasons that can be given.

Now, I thoroughly agree that if there are misrepresentations touching the service in either the Army or the Navy they should be stopped, but I do not believe that it is fair to the service to give the impression that young men are generally unfairly treated and that conditions in the service are such as to warrant young men shunning the service.

Most of the men I know are benefited by having served with the colors. I have in mind one particular instance in which a boy enlisted in the Navy. His mother came here to Washington and made a very pathetic appeal to get him out of the service, and there was some reason, because she was a poor woman and in extreme need. It was not possible to do it. That boy served out his enlistment, and one of the first acts he did after he had finished his enlistment was to come to me and say that he was glad that he had not gotten out of the service, that he had served those four years. The result of that service has been to make him a self-respecting man, a man who knew both how to take and give orders—and both are necessary in life—and he was a better citizen because of his service.

While I again repeat that I do not desire any misrepresentation of any sort, yet I think men ought carefully to weigh before they decide entering the Army or the Navy; but having entered it and having incurred obligations and having put the Government to expense, I think real men stand by their contracts, and there is a good deal of complaint made in life simply by the weaklings who do not want any sort of discipline placed upon them.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. The committee has looked very carefully into this matter, and I do not think there is any necessity whatever for it. If there is any criticism whatever of the Navy, it is that the Secretary has gone too far on the side of leniency.

Now, there was, several years ago, too much rigidity, but the present Secretary has abrogated those rules and has gone to an extent where, as it appears in our hearings, the new rules that the present Secretary has put in force suggested a query from a number of the members of the committee as to whether or not he was not going too far on the side of ease and leniency in dealing with the boys, as against maintaining discipline. And so there is no criticism that can be made of the Secretary along that line, and I believe that members of the committee will indorse that statement.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman inform the committee whether in the present state of the labor market there is any dearth of applicants for admission into the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I can state that I have a hearing here in which, last year, Admiral Blue stated that a tabulation was kept, and out of more than 5,000 who made application and enlisted in the Navy that were asked the reason why they enlisted, only about 318, I believe it was, stated that they had joined the Navy because they were out of work. The others gave other and different reasons.

Mr. MOORE. What is the present status of the applications? Have they enough?

Mr. PADGETT. They have a waiting list.

Mr. MOORE. There is a waiting list at this time?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and I want to state that the hearings showed, if I remember the figures correctly, that last year there was only one accepted out of six applicants. They sift them down to the best man and the best class of applicants.

Mr. MOORE. Then there is a greater number of applicants this year than the Navy can accommodate?

Mr. PADGETT. Far more.

Mr. MOORE. Did that condition prevail two years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that there was a waiting list two years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. In 1913; I think so.

Mr. MOORE. Was that so three years ago?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to answer.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that they were advertising then, because they needed men?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy was not fully enlisted two years ago, but it is fully enlisted to-day.

Mr. MOORE. If the list is full and the Navy is turning away applicants, why is it necessary to advertise?

Mr. PADGETT. It is not at the present time; but we do not know what the condition is going to be a year from now.

Mr. COX. How many desertions are there from the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not give the gentleman the exact number, but I understand the percentage is gradually decreasing.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman give an approximate percentage?

Mr. PADGETT. About 3 or 4 per cent.

Mr. COX. And the total enlisted naval strength is how much?

Mr. PADGETT. Fifty-two thousand and a few hundred this morning.

Mr. COX. And the desertions are between 3 and 4 per cent?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; about that. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Navy this morning stating that the enlistment is entirely filled—52,000 and some hundred.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan provides that it shall not be in order to issue literature of any kind containing misinformation which is calculated to deceive men who apply for enlistment or whose enlistment is sought by recruiting officers. Why should any gentleman object to providing that, in theory at least, the Government shall be on the square, and shall not be authorized to publish misinformation calculated to deceive young men?

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit? I do not think there is any necessity for it, because the administration is not doing it.

Mr. MANN. I did not interrupt the gentleman in his statement.

Mr. PADGETT. I asked the gentleman if he would yield.

Mr. MANN. And then the gentleman proceeded before I did yield; but I will yield.

Mr. PADGETT. I thought the gentleman had yielded. The reason is because the administration is not publishing anything to deceive young men.

Mr. MANN. I heard the gentleman's statement.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is necessary to insert that provision.

Mr. MANN. I heard the statement of the gentleman that he did not think it is necessary; but what objection can there be when other gentlemen charge, what everybody knows is true who has ever seen one of these circulars, that the Government issues matter which is calculated to deceive? I am not criticizing the Navy for attempting to fill up the ranks. I received a telegram yesterday morning from the secretary of the federation of labor in Chicago, stating that they appealed to me on a certain proposition in behalf of 250,000 laboring men in Chicago, most of whom are out of employment, and I assume that they know what the facts are. Of course, there is a waiting list in the Navy. With most of 250,000 laboring men out of employment in one city in the country, and the Navy Department buying foreign-made goods for the Navy and giving men no chance to work at an honest trade, why, they apply for a chance to be fed and have a little left over by seeking to enlist in the Navy. You could suppress all your literature, stop all your advertising, and simply indicate some place where men might enlist, and you could fill up the Navy three times in less than a week with men who are unemployed because of your foolish legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gunnery exercises: Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery exercises and target practice; for the establishment and maintenance of shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges; for hiring established ranges, and for transportation of civilian assistants and equipment to and from ranges, \$99,800.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity for employing civilian assistants in these gunnery exercises, and if it is not possible for the service itself to provide all the necessary assistants in that particular?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it is not. In this target practice it is necessary to have certain civilian assistants for short periods of time.

Mr. HULINGS. Why is it necessary?

Mr. PADGETT. It is cheaper.

Mr. HULINGS. Is it any cheaper than to have the men do the work themselves?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. I know there is a theory in the Army and Navy, among a certain class, that it is rather derogatory to do any work, and therefore we see in all these bills provision made to employ men to keep these soldiers and sailors at their duty.

Mr. PADGETT. The bill has provided time out of mind for this appropriation, just as it does now.



Mr. HULINGS. The fact that it has provided for it time out of mind is not of itself any reason why it should be provided in the future.

Mr. PADGETT. I rather think so. I think what men find necessary is an argument. The common law grew up out of that.

Mr. HULINGS. I move to strike out, in line 5, page 9, the words "and for transportation of civilian assistants."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 5, strike out the words "and for transportation of civilian assistants."

Mr. PADGETT. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ocean and lake surveys: Hydrographic surveys, including the pay of the necessary hydrographic surveyors, cartographic draftsmen and recorders, and for the purchase and printing of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, \$105,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding five, as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to inquire first where it is proposed to have the printing done under this appropriation?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know whether the Hydrographic Office itself does its own printing or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does its own printing.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We were told by Capt. Washington that the cost of the printing was based on the estimates of the Public Printer. Whether that would indicate that the printing was to be done at the Government Printing Office I do not know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Hydrographic Office prints its own charts.

Mr. MANN. Then, if the cost is based on the estimates of the Government Printing Office, and they are to be printed there, why is not the item for printing carried where it belongs—in the sundry civil bill—instead of in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that I have a copy of some of the sailing directions here. I think there are about 38 volumes. They have to be rewritten and corrected and kept up to date, and the department is very much behind in this work. They have received notice from the British Admiralty that they will not hereafter furnish these sailing directions, and it is necessary that we should do that ourselves. In order to do it properly, it is necessary to have the work done by experienced naval men.

Mr. MANN. What does the British Admiralty do for sailing directions and charts of American waters?

Mr. PADGETT. They copy them from ours.

Mr. MANN. They can get ours, but they are not going to allow us to get theirs?

Mr. PADGETT. We have been purchasing theirs and using the English print.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. We never have printed sailing directions for our own Navy. We have always depended on the British Admiralty for the books similar to those on the table before the chairman of the committee; covering all the naval waters, there are 38 volumes. Since the war has broken out the British Admiralty, through the selling agents, have notified the Hydrographic Office that no more sailing directions will be sold, as they are fearful that they may get into the hands of the enemy. We are further told by the Hydrographic Office that since the Admiralty has shut down, the Hydrographic Office of the Navy Department has been overwhelmed with requests from American merchants for sailing directions, and the Navy Department is not able to supply them. If we make this appropriation to print the sailing directions by the Navy Department, they can sell more than enough to pay the cost of the printing, and the Government will not only be self-supporting so far as providing the warships with sailing directions is concerned, but they will be able to make a profit on the sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. To get the information that I want to get a little more fully, I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. What do the merchant vessels of the world do now in reference to sailing directions?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Up to the time of the breaking out of the European war the merchant captains of the world could buy the British Sailing Directions from the agents in the various ports of the world. We had them in this country, where the Navy Department or any merchant captain could go and buy a book of sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. The question I asked the gentleman was, What do the captains of the merchant vessels do now?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. They are doing without them, relying on the Coast Pilot for sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. Everybody knows that the gentleman from Massachusetts is mistaken about that. The merchant vessels of the world know a great deal more about sailing than the officers of the fleet will ever learn, because that is their whole business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Illinois does not mean to say that our merchant vessels do not sail on British sailing directions, does he?

Mr. MANN. Certainly I do not; they do sail on them; and they get them without any difficulty, and they have always got them. When you talk about furnishing secret information to some enemy, why, every nation in the world has these charts; every merchant vessel that sails the seas; and it is nonsense to talk about secret information.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not secret information; it is public.

Mr. GARDNER. Is not this true, that vessels sail on the Coast Pilot and the Coast Pilot might be antiquated? It might not show a breakwater that had been recently constructed, or a new lighthouse, for instance. The merchant vessels and the smaller vessels often do not take pains to keep the Coast Pilot up to date.

Mr. MANN. They do attempt to keep the Coast Pilot up to date where they sail the seas.

Mr. GARDNER. Some do.

Mr. MANN. I do not know about those sailing out of the gentleman's district, but those on the Great Lakes do.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no; no self-respecting coastwise skipper would have one of those Coast Pilots aboard unless it was 20 years old.

Mr. MANN. They are that much behind the times. If the gentleman claims that, I will not deny it. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. I will read from a communication given us by Capt. Washington. In November last, he says, the following letter was received from the agent for the sale of British Admiralty Charts and Sailing Directions:

I am instructed to give notice that no supplies of Admiralty charts are to be made without authority to any European countries or subjects of those countries, with the exception of France, Russia, Greece, and Portugal. Applications for charts from all other parts of the world are to be submitted for consideration. Further, no sales are to be allowed to any customer until the bona fides of the purchaser has been satisfactorily proved and a certificate stating the name of the customer, nationality, service, and ship or shipping company for which the charts are required has been received.

Mr. MANN. Do they claim this is as the result of the war?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not that apply to European countries exclusively?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will recall that last year they were insisting on the consideration of this bill, which was before the war broke out, that they must make themselves all of these foreign charts and cease to buy them. They made that claim then. The war comes along, and hence the claim is made that the war demands that this be done. They were insisting then that they had the power to do that, and the House on two occasions on a vote refused to give them that power.

Mr. PADGETT. Not only publishing the charts, but these Sailing Directions; and, as I said, there are 38 volumes.

Mr. MANN. No; it is what they are seeking now—power to print sailing charts for the entire world. They want to go into the business of making surveys all over the world, and printing the charts, and have different nations doing the same work over and over again. I can not imagine anything that is more expensively ridiculous than that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These sailing charts are issued and printed from time to time, are they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, if the British Admiralty will not furnish the information about these charts, what are we going to do to make the corrections and changes necessary to keep them and make them of service instead of a menace to men who are relying upon them?

Mr. PADGETT. We have their charts up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But our charts are changed every day almost. Even the charts that we issue of our own coast and the charts the British Admiralty issues of the coasts which they survey are changed and modified by the notations of new obstructions or new lights or improvements in rivers and harbors, or anything else that may be of use to the navigators. Are we to print these Sailing Directions, and then, unable to obtain the information that is necessary to keep them up to date, continue to sell these Sailing Directions that may be more of a menace than an advantage to those who use them?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they are to be corrected and made correct up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How can they be corrected up to date if we can not buy any more?

Mr. PADGETT. We have them up to date.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Our own officers will correct them up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have not them up to date.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The last issue of the book is up to date, and our officers correct them from that on.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How are our officers going to correct them unless they have survey vessels?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It does not require surveys to correct sailing directions. The gentleman is confused as between charts and a book of sailing directions.

Mr. MANN. Of course it does not require a survey to correct a sailing direction, but it requires a survey to know whether you want to.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No, indeed; the corrections are for the most part from reports that come in through maritime channels and also through naval channels, changes in shoals, and newly discovered obstructions to navigation, and new landmarks, lighthouses, bell buoys, signals, and aids to navigation, and all those things. That is what goes into Sailing Directions and what needs correction.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These reports are sold either by the British Admiralty or the British Board of Trade.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in line 24, page 10, "and printing," specifically on the ground that this committee does not have jurisdiction over printing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the authorization to detail five officers.

Mr. MANN. That is the proviso which has not yet been disposed of.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to be sure that that point of order will not be omitted.

Mr. MANN. First I make the point of order on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order to the words "on printing," in line 24, page 10.

Mr. PADGETT. It is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving now the point of order on the proviso, what is the reason for the increase in the number of officers transferred?

Mr. PADGETT. They have four now, and it is stated that being so far behind on account of the war, and having to do so much work, they need additional officers. They wanted more than that, but the committee recommended one increase.

Mr. MANN. How much of an increase did they get last year?

Mr. PADGETT. One.

Mr. MANN. And they are further behind now than then?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the question and get some answer to it without some one else trying to answer it. As I understand the gentleman, they are not further behind now than they were last year?

Mr. PADGETT. They are trying to catch up.

Mr. MANN. Notwithstanding the war, they are gaining?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say that they are gaining.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is it; the gentleman answers one way and then when you get that answer and would ask another question he backs water. Are they gaining or not?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Why did not the gentleman say so in the first place?

Mr. PADGETT. I did say so.

Mr. MANN. Until somebody answers who does know, I make the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield a moment. We are informed by the Chief of the Hydrographic Office that they need this additional officer to correct the sailing

directions and get ready a large number of volumes for printing.

Mr. MANN. Well, let them use one of the four officers they have now to correct the needed sailing directions. What are they doing with them? Trying to correct 38 volumes in order to print them? That is the trouble with the Hydrographic Office, doing a lot of work it ought not to do instead of doing the work that is demanded—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Sailing directions are as necessary to the battleships as the compass is to the battleships.

Mr. MANN. Nobody ever disputed that. They need a great deal more than sailing directions on most battleships if they ever get to any place.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. While we can not get the recognized sailing directions of the world because of the war in Europe, the gentleman from Illinois would have us continue in the position we are, whereby the United States will be under the thumb of some foreign nation for these needed sailing charts and sailing directions, and when the time of war comes in that foreign country we are absolutely without those needed charts and sailing directions, whereas the expenditure of a few thousand dollars would make us absolutely independent of any nation on earth.

Mr. MANN. I think the best place for the American fleet at present is in American waters. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order on the proviso. The Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman if he will not make it to the word "five" and let us have the language as it was last year?

Mr. MANN. I am willing to let it go at that if it is expected to stay there.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the Senate is going to do.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman—

Mr. MANN. I am not quarreling with the committee now. I know what the gentleman expects to do; but I guess some of us will be here when the Senate amendment comes back. We knocked it out last year, and we can knock out the whole item. The Hydrographic Office will not stand scrutiny.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "four."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can offer his amendment afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer an amendment to the proviso as printed with the substitution of the word "four" for the word "five."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 25, after the figures "\$105,000," insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding four, which may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out line 25, page 10, "\$105,000" and insert "\$80,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 25, strike out "\$105,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$80,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the gentleman to make his motion read \$90,000, which was the amount of last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can do that when I have finished what I have to say. Mr. Chairman, I have moved to strike out "\$105,000" and insert "\$80,000" because that is the amount the department estimated and requested Congress to provide. Ninety thousand dollars was appropriated for the current year. When the estimates of the Navy Department were being prepared the condition of the work in the Hydrographic Office must have been so very satisfactory that the department itself proposed to reduce the appropriation by 11 per cent. The estimates were prepared, it must be remembered, after the outbreak of the European war. The action of the agent of the British Admiralty in the sale of charts may not have been anticipated, but it was apparent to the department that \$80,000 was the proper sum to request to carry on this work.

The Hydrographic Office has been for years endeavoring to reach out and grasp considerable power that Congress has repeatedly declined to permit it to exercise. All of the surveys, the furnishing of charts, Coast Pilots, and Sailing Directions for the coasts of the United States, including Alaska, the Philip-



pine Islands, Guam, the Hawaiian Islands, and entrances to the Panama Canal, are furnished by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. All information of a similar character on the Great Lakes is now furnished by the service in the War Department, which makes the Lake surveys.

The Hydrographic Office is supposed to make the surveys and soundings of certain other places and to correct and to keep up to date or to furnish charts of foreign countries. The \$25,000 increase was proposed for the purpose of enabling the Hydrographic Office to print the 30 volumes of Sailing Directions heretofore mentioned. After the books are published additional or supplemental statements are continually issued in the form of leaves or pamphlets giving corrections and additional information which are absolutely essential if the books are to be used intelligently. We have no such system in existence, nor is it possible for the United States to institute a system by which in all maritime countries of the world agencies will be established through which the navigators of marine vessels of the world will report to some official of the United States information regarding changes or modifications or improvements in harbors that are essential if the sailing directions are to be continued in such shape as may be essential to be of any value.

I listened to the reading of the letter by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], in which assertion was made that it was impossible to obtain the British Admiralty Charts for sailing directions any further, and I noticed that there was no absolute prohibition against the selling of them to the United States. The object of the instructions issued by the British Admiralty was to prevent the sailing directions falling into the hands of the country with which Great Britain is now engaged in war. There is nothing to lead to the belief that the United States is to be excluded from this information, but if it be we have a simple and effective way to retaliate by refusing to furnish to other maritime nations the Coast Pilot and Sailing Directions of our own coast.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the "80" and make it "90."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "\$80,000" and inserting "\$90,000."

Mr. PADGETT. That is the amount that has been carried for two or three years. Admiral Blue, chief of the bureau, says:

Since these estimates were made last summer, certain matters have turned up in connection with the war showing that those British Admiralty charts are at present very hard to get, and that there would be a good deal of difficulty in getting all of them if needed. We have recommended the cutting down of the appropriation from \$90,000 to \$80,000, although I am inclined to believe now it ought to be \$90,000, on account of the difficulty in getting the British Admiralty charts.

When they struck out the printing it was my purpose to move to amend to make it "\$90,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why did not the department submit a supplemental estimate, as required by law, if it believed an additional amount was required in addition to that estimated?

Mr. PADGETT. I believe they thought the amount submitted in the estimates was sufficient.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman may think that way, but the law requires the department to submit such estimates. If the committee does not insist on the department complying with the law, it will not do so. The head of the department has submitted an estimate for \$80,000, and there is nothing but the information furnished, not by the head of the department, but by the chief of some bureau, that an additional amount to what the department requested will be necessary. I do not believe that in a time like the present, with the existing condition of the Federal Treasury, the Congress should go out of its way and offer the department more money than the department requested in the manner provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 2, page 11, insert: "Provided, That no books, charts, and sailing directions authorized hereunder shall be sold or exchanged with any nation that declines, through any governmental agency, the books, charts, or sailing directions published by such Government to sell or exchange them with our Government."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it has been officially called to the attention of this House that the British Admiralty has absolutely refused to exchange these charts and books which the maritime commerce of this country is dependent upon, but continues that policy with certain excepted nations, such as Portugal, Greece, France, and, I believe, Russia. I believe it is time to call a halt to this imperious policy of the British Admiralty. Frequently I have had occasion to present grievances of American shippers to the State Department for infringement by Great Britain of the rights of neutrals to ship merchandise to customers in neutral countries, and the only reply I would receive was that the British Admiralty was dominating the diplomatic policy of Great Britain. Has it come to that pass in the history of our Government when it can be officially brought to our attention by a representative of the Navy Department that the British Government declines and absolutely refuses to exchange its publications or allow us to have the benefit of a publication when we are giving them publications of a like character for their aid without some retaliatory action? They have gone far enough, I say, in trying to impede American commerce while letting their own commerce with neutral countries continue unimpeded.

The purpose of this amendment is to give notice that if they do not wish to exchange the 43 volumes of their publications so that they can come to our aid, then we will decline to furnish them the 14 publications of a similar character that we publish covering our jurisdiction. I think no one who has any American spirit in his veins will object, when we have had called to our attention the autocratic policy of the British Admiralty in trying to thwart and check our American commerce, to adopting this policy of reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this, of course, is the greatest age of all time, and it is capable of greater achievements than ever have been enacted before in the world's history; but it is also an age of the greatest bunk endured by humankind. We are susceptible to much that is not real. We are largely in the hands of fakirs, principally on the outside of Congress. We are even swayed in Congress by faking propositions. Men come to us who want to advertise themselves. They organize societies for the public uplift, and they impose themselves upon Congressmen. Some of them do this in order to assure themselves of good audiences when they get upon the lecture platform. I have no desire to pursue this further than to say that while we are discussing the Hydrographic Office in the matter of coast charts, I am reminded that that office still has before it, or in its custody, at least 21 volumes of observations made by Robert E. Peary, a civil engineer of the Government of the United States, who made important discoveries in the Arctic regions. Since those records were deposited with the Hydrographic Office Peary has been generally acknowledged as the discoverer of the North Pole.

It has been conceded by the whole world, but there are still men who love to appear in the public eye and who are actuated by a desire to make money upon the lecture platform, who insist that they have a right to dispute the fact.

The Congress of the United States settled this question; it had settled it not only upon the resolutions of the National Geographic Society, but upon the testimony of scientists the world over. With the acquiescence of the scientific societies of the world Congress passed an act recognizing the services of Robert E. Peary, making him a rear admiral, and ascribing to him, an American, the world achievement of reaching the North Pole. That act was passed and approved by the President March 4, 1911. It read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to place Civil Engineer Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, on the retired list of the Corps of Civil Engineers with the rank of rear admiral, to date from April 6, 1909, with the highest retired pay of that grade under existing law.

Sec. 2. That the thanks of Congress be, and the same are hereby, tendered to Robert E. Peary, United States Navy, for his Arctic explorations, resulting in reaching the North Pole.

Now, after four years the lecturer's press agency has got to work and Congress is asked to undo its own act. The Committee



on Education of the House has before it now a joint resolution which proposes "to establish the priority of the discovery of the North Pole and the region contiguous thereto." The old contention is to be reopened at our expense, for the benefit of whom? I shall read the resolution:

Whereas the discovery of the North Pole and the region contiguous thereto involves questions of historic, scientific, geographic, economic, educational, and commercial importance: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the priority of discovery of the North Pole and the region contiguous thereto be established and declared by Congress, in order that lands discovered by American explorers in the far North may be described and designated as territory of the United States and so set forth in the maps prepared and distributed by the United States Government.

That is the resolution; but under the rose it might as well read, "*Be it resolved*, That we the Congress of the United States open this whole controversy and invite in all the friends of Doc. Cook to prove that he got somewhere near enough to the North Pole to justify the people coming to hear him on the lecture platform."

Members of Congress have been receiving messages from the press agents of the lecturer and they have been favored with copies of his book, but the limit has been reached when the Committee on Education begins to take the statements of a stenographer as to the doctor's dictation for the magazines from his hotel retreat at Newburgh on the Hudson.

Mr. Chairman, the amount of mail matter that comes to us every morning from people who get the idea that they are the real and only uplifters of the country is amazing. Some of it may be earnest, but much of it is designing. We are bombarded with vaporings along with good sense, but we ought to be able to distinguish the work of those who are shrewd enough to employ the services of press agents to inspire us with misinformation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Some of you gentlemen have been receiving communications similar to the one I hold in my hand, showing the extent to which this thing is worked. It is not that the laws that are actually passed here are not sufficient to occupy our attention. We have to deal with certain people who live upon their wits, just the same as if they were "passing it" to us on the street. Here is the latest message bearing the earmarks of the publicity artist. It is coming in now from gullible writers who do not know they are aiding the publicity game:

I believe that Harry K. Thaw has been persicuted enough and should be given his liberty at once; and restored to his Family and beg you sir; to use your influence in Congress to pass a law in accordance with the Constitution.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, in very much of what has been said by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] I think all of us will agree. However, I think the gentleman is very much mistaken when he says that Congress has determined that Lieut. or Capt. or Admiral Peary discovered the North Pole. The difficulty about the action of Congress in regard to that was that it did not say so. The language of the resolution and of the law is that he reached the pole, and these distinctions were given him on that account.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOORE. The act says that Peary "reached" the pole.

Mr. TOWNER. But it does not say that he discovered the pole. For that reason the question, as these other men claim, is left open for consideration still.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that Lieut. Peary reached the pole near enough for all purposes of discovery?

Mr. TOWNER. I presume it is. I am not arguing that proposition.

Mr. MOORE. Why open this question, then, in the interest of a gentleman who is lecturing and who has press agents paid to furnish us with information about his achievements?

Mr. TOWNER. I hope that all of us have open minds regarding that question now; and certainly I am not here as the advocate or the representative of anybody who believes

that anybody else discovered the North Pole. But I am merely correcting the gentleman's statement when he said to the House that Congress had determined that Lieut. Peary had discovered the North Pole.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that it would have been better, perhaps, for all if Congress had so determined, because then, so far at least as official action is concerned, it would have been settled. But to say that the North Pole was reached is not to say that the North Pole was discovered. Both of these contending parties and perhaps others may have reached the North Pole, and still the question of discovery or priority in reaching the North Pole may be an entirely open question.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I am somewhat acquainted with this dispute, which has been going on now for about six or seven years. May I ask the gentleman what part of the controversy the Committee on Education is hearing—what part of it—whether or not Cook reached the North Pole first? Is that the contention, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Education have taken no action in regard to the matter. They have only given a preliminary hearing to some parties that the chairman decided would perhaps be able to give us information.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Would it be violating the confidence of the committee if the gentleman told us who has appeared before the committee thus far? The newspapers have stated that a stenographer who took notes for Dr. Cook appeared before the committee.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do not know what pertinency this has to the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). Does the gentleman from Missouri make the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled.

Mr. MOORE. We are discussing a paragraph that pertains to the hydrographic service of the Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is aware of that. The point of order is made that the gentleman is not speaking in order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Would it have any effect on the mind of the Chair if I should call the Chair's attention—

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair sustains the point of order. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not proper to discuss the matter of coast charts of the Arctic regions when we have reached the paragraph pertaining to the Hydrographic Office in the Navy Department, which prepares those charts?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to pass upon the character of the discussion on any paragraph when a point of order is made. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE. Then the Chair declines to answer?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ocean and lake surveys: Hydrographic surveys, including the pay of the necessary hydrographic surveyors, cartographic draftsmen and recorders, and for the purchase and printing of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, \$105,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to detail such naval officers, not exceeding five, as may be necessary to the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it was refined cruelty to stop me this morning right in the midst of a two-minute speech, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he may speak out of order for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will confine himself to three minutes, I will not object.



Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will not make any promises as to what I may do. I have made the request. If you want to object, you may object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman has had time to discuss his political views, but I am willing he should take three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this morning I started to reply to the oration on peace delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY], and I was going to call attention to the fact that this morning the press carried a notice that Sir Edward Grey has served notice upon the State Department that to purchase the interned ships, as proposed under what is known as the administration shipping bill, would be an unneutral act.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If I can get an extension of time of two minutes, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; not now; unless I can get an extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will at the end of three minutes, if I can get any more time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman seemed to want information on this subject, and I thought I would give it to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman can give it in his own time.

The question I started to ask was, If the statement is correct that that information has been in the State Department for 10 days, why has it not been given to the country? That is one of the vital questions in that bill. That is one of the propositions that the body at the other end of this Capitol rejected only yesterday by a vote, declaring that they would not prohibit the purchase of these interned vessels; and we have it upon the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I presume it is fair to say that he represents the administration, that the purpose under this bill is to purchase these interned German ships. Now, if the President is in favor of peace, as we all believe and all hope he is, why is he insisting on this bill being pushed through at the expense of every other matter pending before this Congress, to pass this bill that—as has been expressed by Senator Roor—means the buying of a quarrel? Is he headed in the direction of peace when he does that?

Just one more proposition in regard to Mexico. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] said we had no war down there. I should like to know what you do term it? Nineteen of our own men and more than 100 of the Mexicans were killed. We are told that they collected a million dollars—and for what? Who had the authority to collect that million dollars? Where is it, and what are they going to do with it? Is that calculated to produce peace?

Mr. Chairman, I did not care to make this speech, only I wanted to demonstrate that I could do it; that is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I expect to make a statement that is not strictly in order; but, in view of what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has said, I think it should go into the Record at this point. Of course, if any gentleman desires to object, I will surrender the floor.

A great many statements are made in the newspapers, some of which come from reliable sources and some not; but about great matters of state, that involve our intercourse with foreign Governments, I think it is not timely, nor is it wise, for Members of the House to rely on those statements and base their positions upon them without first taking the trouble to inquire as to whether the statements are correct or not. As to the statement which the gentleman has just made, I saw the telegram in the morning paper stating that there was a letter from Sir Edward Grey protesting against the purchase of these ships, and I called up the State Department on the phone and asked if that statement in the morning paper was correct, and I am authorized by the State Department to deny categorically that the statement is correct. There is no such letter there, and there never has been such a letter there. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, Cal.: Maintenance of naval training station, Yerba Buena Island, Cal., namely: Labor and material; build-

ings and wharves; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and wharves; wharfage, ferriage, and street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; wagons, carts, implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire engines and extinguishers; gymnastic implements, models, and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and materials, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; fresh water, and washing; packing boxes and materials; and all other contingent expenses; maintenance of dispensary building; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; in all, \$70,000.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the chairman what is the necessity of this provision for the operation of one horse-drawn vehicle that has not been provided for before?

Mr. PADGETT. We have had it before and maintained it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It does not appear in the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. It was not necessary until the legislative bill of last year was passed, which contained a provision requiring it to be inserted in the proper bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That requires it to be provided for specifically?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and that accounts for these provisions in all these places.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert the words "passenger-carrying" after the word "horse-drawn."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 11, after the words "horse-drawn," insert the words "passenger-carrying."

Mr. MANN. Without that the language in the bill means nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval War College, Rhode Island: For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes, and care of grounds for same, \$25,250; services of a lecturer on international law, \$2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, \$300; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, \$1,300: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed \$12,500; in all, Naval War College, Rhode Island, \$28,850.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What is the particular necessity of providing "that the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical inspection, drafting, and messenger service shall not exceed," and so forth?

Mr. PADGETT. At the War College they have a large force to do the work. The officers gather there, they suggest plans and devise plans, and they need a large clerical force for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF ORDNANCE.

Ordnance and ordnance stores: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department; for furniture at naval magazines, torpedo stations, and proving ground; for maintenance of the proving ground and powder factory and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval magazines, the naval proving ground, Indian-head, Md., and naval torpedo stations, and for pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval magazines: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval magazines for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, shall not exceed \$468,000; in all, \$5,795,420: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of any appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of shells or projectiles for the Navy except for shells or projectiles purchased in accordance with the terms and conditions of proposals submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to all the manufacturers of shells and projectiles and upon bids received in accordance with the terms and requirements of such proposals: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to purchases of shells or projectiles of an experimental nature or to be used for experimental purposes and paid for from the appropriation "Experiments, Bureau of Ordnance."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. What is the change, if any, made in the proviso to that carried in the existing current law?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any at all.

Mr. MANN. Then what is the object of inserting permanent law again? The gentleman awhile ago wanted to make permanent law in order that the provisions might be eliminated from the appropriation bills hereafter. We carried this item in the bill last year.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no change in it.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman ought to move to strike it out.

Mr. PADGETT. I overlooked the word "hereafter," and therefore failed to leave it out.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso beginning with the word "Provided," line 17, page 16, down to the end of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17, at the end of line 2—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that the proviso has been stricken out.

Mr. HOBSON. This has nothing to do with the proviso, and it comes in at the end of the paragraph, and so it would begin on page 16, line 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, at the end of line 17, insert the following:

"Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells or projectiles for the Navy unless such shells of 12-inch caliber are found by tests to be able to penetrate 10 inches Kruppized plate without breaking up when fired with a standard service-powder charge at an actual range of 12,000 yards."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the matter?

Mr. PADGETT. I have no argument to make.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that a point of order has been raised?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves the point of order.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to standardize the armor-piercing projectiles upon which our Navy is so largely relying for its effectiveness. The requirements provided here simply make it necessary for acceptance of the shell, that the expenditure of money from this appropriation for shell shall not proceed unless this type of shell can be shown to be reasonably effective at the usual battle ranges under ordinary service conditions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this involve the purchase of a particular type of shell?

Mr. HOBSON. No; it involves no purchase at all. It simply puts a limitation upon the purchase of shell of a type unless they comply with the condition imposed.

Mr. MADDEN. Would there be any difficulty in getting the kind of shell that would meet the provisions named in this proposed legislation?

Mr. HOBSON. Not if they are to be effective.

Mr. MADDEN. Would there be any difficulty in getting the type of shell the gentleman describes?

Mr. HOBSON. I think there would be.

Mr. MADDEN. If we could not get them, what would the effect on the utility of the Navy be?

Mr. PADGETT. Just shut up the purchase of all kinds of shells.

Mr. HOBSON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee is mistaken. He will get time in his own right in a moment. Mr. Chairman, this armor-piercing shell has as its object the penetration of the heavy armor of naval vessels. Its effectiveness against light construction is meager, because it goes through and does not explode; that is, upon light superstructure work and sometimes upon light armor. Its effect in that case would not be as great as other types of shell. In the penetration of heavy armor, however, at battle ranges of 12,000 yards, this situation will arise. Our ships have 12 and 13 and even 13½ inches of Kruppized armor. All we are building now have that or better; so have similar ships abroad. The armor-piercing shell must penetrate that heavy armor at battle ranges or the shell is not effective. If the armor-piercing shell is to be an effective shell, then it ought to be able to stand up and not go to pieces when it strikes the armor it is intended to penetrate. For my part, I believe that this shell can be so constructed. I will say to the gentleman that in tests not long ago—and all this is the outcome of a long series of tests—the department, speaking in generalities, was disappointed because of the fact that the armor-piercing shell did not perform the service to make it effective at ordinary battle ranges under these conditions. I took up the question with them as to the improvement of the armor-piercing shell. They have undertaken to bring about these improvements. What happened was that the shell itself would break up on the outside

of the armor. The effectiveness of an armor-piercing shell depends on its ability to get through the armor so that the explosion of the shell will take place behind the heavy armor. If that takes place then it can blast through the protective deck and get into the vitals and destroy the ship. If that is not the case, then it is ineffective. The Navy has been stocking up for years and years with millions of dollars worth of these ineffective shells.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBSON. We have been stocking up for years and years, and now we have a vast supply of these armor-piercing shells on hand; and I feel, as I believe those who have been following these experiments with me do, that the armor-piercing shell must be improved or must give way to another type. Unfortunately only a few manufacturers make the armor-piercing shell, and we are practically compelled to rely upon them. The provision of permanent law which has just been referred to has for years effectively prevented other companies coming in and starting up to compete. Be that as it may, we ought to require that in the expenditure in the future of such large sums of money for shells intended to perform a certain duty that they ought to endeavor to make the shell effective.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman's idea is that unless the shell can be made as effective as described in his amendment, instead of purchasing new shells which will not meet the requirements we should proceed to the use of the shells that we already have in stock, until the experiments have improved the efficacy of this shell?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. But that in the meantime no new shells be purchased?

Mr. HOBSON. Not of that type. If that shell can not be effective at a reasonable range, it ought to be abandoned. Twelve thousand yards is a short battle range. It has been used in the present war, even with 8 and 9 inch guns. Off the coast of Chile the battle was fought at twelve and fourteen thousand yards, and likewise the battle of the Falkland Islands, and if this shell can not penetrate 10 inches of armor at 12,000 yards, we ought not to depend upon it in the future.

Mr. MADDEN. Are we purchasing that shell now?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; exclusively.

Mr. MADDEN. What thickness of armor does it penetrate?

Mr. HOBSON. I will say to the gentleman that down here at Indianhead, at a short range, they seem to have reasonable penetration, but when we get up to twelve and fourteen thousand yards, or even 10,000 yards, they fail. They can not penetrate, in fact, even 8 inches of armor at that distance.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the statement made by Admiral Strauss in the hearings, in which he said:

We do not manufacture the armor-piercing shell. We are going to manufacture some experimental armor-piercing projectiles ourselves.

In view of that experimental work on the part of the department, would it not be unwise for Congress to limit the expenditure to a particular class of shell at this time?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, this amendment would not limit the expenditure for any class of shell; that is, would not compel the purchase of any other class of shell.

It covered experimentations which have been going on all these years and which we hope will produce that incentive in private manufacturers that will make a shell that will be effective. Now, in order to make a shell effective, whether from experimentation in the Navy or outside, this appropriation is available for that purpose. In other words, the effect of this would be that instead of having a stereotyped test of a shell at Indian Head Proving Grounds, where under certain conditions close to the muzzle of the gun the shell penetrates certain thicknesses of armor plate, and then by certain calculations they assume it will penetrate an enemy's armor at battle ranges, we have under the direction of the special subcommittee the tests on the long ranges. There is no difficulty in the test. You can hit at those ranges. We fired eighty-odd shots, and got 26 hits—a large part of them at 12,000 yards.

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true, as I understand it, but—

Mr. HOBSON. So there will be no difficulty in this new type of test.

Mr. TOWNER. But this limitation is on the 12-inch shell.



Mr. HOBSON. If they can not produce an effective 12-inch shell they can not produce an effective shell of other caliber. If the shells are not effective, it is a waste of money to continue buying them.

Mr. TOWNER. That is exactly the point. Now, you are limiting this purchase to a certain type of shell, if we adopt the gentleman's amendment before the department—

Mr. HOBSON. Pardon me, there is no limitation.

Mr. TOWNER (continuing). Has made these experiments in order to ascertain whether it should be of value.

Mr. HOBSON. Pardon me; we are not limiting the purchase of any type. What we do is that while they are now spending so much money on this particular type that type ought to be effective before the money is spent in the future.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Do I understand the gentleman to state that this particular type of shell is a shell that is being used almost exclusively by the Navy?

Mr. HOBSON. Practically exclusively.

Mr. HELM. And it is ineffective?

Mr. HOBSON. It is ineffective.

Mr. HELM. Then please explain to me what is the necessity or sense in expending \$100,000,000 of money for battleships when we have shells that are ineffective?

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct; that is a searching question. If our battleships can not execute at battle ranges, why, it is a waste of money to build battleships; but the experiments that have been going on have convinced me that the A. P. shell can be improved; that they can make a shell, if they would, that would fill these reasonable requirements; and that if they will not do it, they can make other shells that will be effective.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. HELM. How long has the Navy been using this particular type of shell?

Mr. HOBSON. They have been using it for years, but assuming all the time it would do the work, and then, when they tried it, it would not do it.

Mr. HELM. Do I understand, now, we have been expending from \$125,000,000 to \$150,000,000 for purchase or construction of battleships and have only this type of shell available for use?

Mr. HOBSON. That is the situation. We have spent millions and millions on that shell and we have had the greatest difficulty in obtaining the experimentation to improve that shell, or develop other types if they can, but I believe we can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. I believe a crime has been committed somewhere then, because from the statement of facts made by the gentleman there has never been a time when our battleships could have gone into an action or engagement with an enemy, since they have virtually been without ammunition, if the shells are worthless, as described by the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withdraw the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is a good point.

Mr. HOBSON. If the gentleman desires to discuss it, I also desire to discuss that phase of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the amendment. Now, I wish to call the attention of the committee to this proposed amendment. I think it is a very hazardous amendment. In the first place the shells that we are using are the same class of shells that are used in all the navies of the world, the armor-piercing shells, and ours are as good as those of any other country, and our experts say they are better. Now you notice the wording of this limitation—

Mr. HOBSON. Would the gentleman yield; I will not take up his time and I will ask for an extension in case he needs it. Can the gentleman tell us that the shells in use elsewhere are limited to this type of shell and are not superior to these?

Mr. PADGETT. My information is that ours are not only equal but superior to the armor-piercing shells in use in all other navies and they are so regarded, and many countries buy their shells here from the same people who make ours.

Mr. HOBSON. I would like for the gentleman to specify in these generalities he is giving, if he has no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I have nothing to specify. I have stated it explicitly. Now let me call attention to the wording: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the

purchase of armor-piercing shells and projectiles of the Navy." Now, that includes 14-inch shells, 12-inch shells, 13-inch shells, 10-inch shells, 8-inch shells, 6-inch shells, all of which are armor-piercing shells, and none of these shells are to be purchased if the 12-inch shell does not accomplish what the gentleman thinks it ought to accomplish.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield again there?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. I want to say to the gentleman that if he wishes to put in a similar limitation upon the 14-inch shell that it must penetrate 12 inches of armor at 14,000 yards, and a 10-inch that it must penetrate 8 inches at 10,000 yards, I have no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. He prohibits the caliber of all kinds of shell in the event that the 12-inch shell fails to accomplish the purpose he designates.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman does not take the amendment to include all types?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. HOBSON. The double word "shells or projectiles" was used, because projectiles or shells have been found together in the proviso that was stricken out.

Mr. PADGETT. Shells and projectiles are synonymous. Now, the wording, "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells or projectiles for the Navy," comprehends all shapes and classes of shells from the largest to the smallest.

Mr. HOBSON. Of the armor-piercing type?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly. That was what was intended. I thought you meant all types.

Mr. HOBSON. It would prohibit the purchase of 14-inch shells of this type if it was found that the 12-inch shell—a fair representative of the type—did not do its work. The failure of the 12-inch would be a fair index of the whole type.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how long will the debate run on this amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Just a few minutes.

Mr. MANN. Why not arrange the time?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes for myself and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. I do not want to cut it off, however—

Mr. MANN. I would like five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] wants five minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHURICK] wants three.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask that debate close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by myself.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like 10 minutes on this.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by myself and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. And I will yield to Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman has not stated yet whether he wishes to close debate on this amendment or the paragraph?

Mr. PADGETT. On the paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER. I will have to object, because I wish to be heard on the paragraph and not on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and the pending amendment close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I object to that, because I want to discuss the question of mines, which I understand is included, although not by name, in this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I will make it on this amendment, then. If that takes up the question of mines, I will want five minutes in which to reply. I will say 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. And 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] and 10 minutes to myself on this particular amendment, and then 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and 5 minutes to myself on the other matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I desire to offer myself. During the general debate on this bill I was assured by the chairman of the committee that I could have 20 minutes for the purpose of discussing the question of shells.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman want to use his 20 minutes on this paragraph?

Mr. FOWLER. There is no other paragraph in the bill in relation to this matter.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I thought there was a sort of understanding myself.

Mr. HOBSON. Limit it to this particular amendment.

Mr. MANN. We would never get through. I think there was an understanding that my colleague was to have time.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not know that he wanted it at this time.

Mr. MANN. Make it 50 minutes, of which he will have 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments close in 50 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. I want simply to add that, having as good shells if not better than all other nations, it would be wise for us to impede the procurement of projectiles elsewhere. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] reserves four minutes.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee what has been done with reference to the power-explosive shells?

Mr. PADGETT. There have been considerable tests made, and tests are being conducted now.

Mr. WEBB. I was interested in the matter four or five years ago, and I believe I started the fight on the experiment with explosive shells.

Mr. PADGETT. They have expended four or five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WEBB. Has it been effective?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. We are hoping that something can be realized, but heretofore they have not been able to meet our expectations.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. It is very plain from the evidence that we have had here from time to time that we have as good armor-piercing shells as any other nation has?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; if not better.

Mr. BUTLER. And if we do not use these shells, what in the world will we have to shoot out of these guns?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing in the world.

Mr. BUTLER. We will have to shoot mush, probably.

Mr. PADGETT. Just shoot powder. We will have no shells. And, then, I want to add again that our condition as to shells, while it is good, is not plethoric, and we ought to have these shells.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a short question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. What is the lifetime of these shells?

Mr. PADGETT. Just as long as the world lasts, if the shell is not destroyed.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. It is different from the cartridges intended for small arms?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it has no powder to it. It is separate from the powder.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I see.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used three minutes. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to use some of his time?

Mr. HOBSON. I will yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to be present at several of the tests which have been referred to, and as the result of my observation at those tests I am in sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

The chairman of the committee says that our armor-piercing shells are as good as, if not better than, the armor-piercing shells made in other nations; but he did not say, as I understood him, that other nations had no other kind of shells than the armor-piercing variety, and if he had said that he would not have convinced me as to the fact. Anyone who has read the account of the Battle of Tshushima Straits in 1898 and noticed the execution done there by Japanese shells will realize they were more efficient than armor-piercing shells. If one will read also of the recent battle near the Falkland Islands or the recent battle in the North Sea, he must reach the conclusion that shells other than armor-piercing shells were there used. According to the experiments I saw the armor-piercing shells would not sink a ship in a week. All they would do at ordinary battle range, if they had penetrated the armor at all, would be only to make a hole in it, and it could be easily stopped and the water kept out, so that no danger would follow.

The experiments I witnessed show that the 12-inch armor-piercing shell at 12,000 yards would simply get its nose through the armor, but the shell would not follow the nose. It would explode outside; and while it made the armor plate look badly, by smudging and discoloration, it did it no further harm. It merely made a hole in the armor plate that could easily be stopped. As battle ranges now are 12,000 yards or more, and the armor-piercing shell will not pierce armor at that distance, I ask what use it is? Why invest money in it? Is it on the theory that the Hindus used to act upon when they would bring out drums and gongs and tin pans and make frightful noises when there was an eclipse of the sun, on the theory that a great dragon was eating it up and they would frighten it away with noise? Are we to frighten our enemy with noise? That is the only use of armor-piercing shells to-day, and this amendment would require them to perfect the armor-piercing shell so that it will do execution; do more than merely make a noise.

But there are other shells. The reading of current history, as well as past history proves it. The *Empress of India*, a British ship, was sunk at 18,000 yards by a shell that tore the side out of the ship. The historian of the Battle of Tsushima Straits tells us that the shells made great holes in the ships as big as barn doors. Those could not have been armor-piercing shells, because armor-piercing shells will make only a hole equal to the diameter of the shell—10 or 12 or 14 inches, as the case may be.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] now to use a part of his time. I will be ready after he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would like to have five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am not just certain in my own mind what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] contemplates in his amendment. If it is his intention by the amendment to compel the Navy Department to continue tests to perfect the armor-piercing shell, I am in sympathy with him. If it is his purpose, however, to stop the purchase of shells of all calibers, as his amendment provides, until we can secure a shell that will do what he wants it to do, I am not in sympathy with the amendment.

The gentleman from Alabama and many other gentlemen, both on this floor and outside, are criticizing the Navy Department and this Government to-day because we have not a sufficient reserve of war material, and I do not think I disclose any Navy secrets when I say we have not a sufficient supply of shells of all calibers in the Navy to-day. If the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama is adopted, we can not buy a shell in the next fiscal year—a shell of any caliber—unless in the short intervening time a 12-inch shell is perfected that will penetrate armor, Kruppized, 10 inches thick at 12,000 yards, and I do not believe the gentleman from Alabama for a moment thinks that such a shell could be perfected within that short time.

Now, we should go on just as we have been going on, purchasing the best there is in existence to-day, and I agree with him that we should at the same time be making the experiments to discover, if possible, something better than that which we have to-day.

Mr. PADGETT. That is being done.



Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Alabama will change his amendment so as to provide for a continuation of experimentation, I will be with him. Otherwise it seems to me suicidal for this Government to stop the purchase of all shells until we can invent one that will do a certain thing, particularly when the experts tell us that we have as good if not a better shell than any of the other nations of the earth. And I want to say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], if he will think a moment, the other day down the river he saw a type of shell fired from one of the guns of our battleships, a shell that explodes on impact, a standard service shell, the semiarmor-piercing shell, so that to-day the Navy of this country is not confined solely to armor-piercing shells. We have the armor-piercing, and we have also what is called the semiarmor-piercing, that explodes on impact, and gives the effect of the outside explosion, which the gentleman from Illinois speaks of as doing such great destruction in the Russo-Japanese War.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will if I have time for just a brief question.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Have we any semiarmor-piercing shell which explodes on impact and produces the effect I have described? In other words, are those shells charged with a high explosive?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I presume they are charged with as high an explosive as can safely be fired from a gun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on ordinance of the Committee on Naval Affairs have been engaged for the last four years, together with gentlemen from the Navy Department, in making certain experiments with certain kinds of shells. We have different classes of shells, one of which has just been described, and I think the others have not been described so thoroughly. We have an armor-piercing shell which, according to the tests, will not pierce 10-inch armor at 12,000 yards. We have the semiarmor-piercing shell, which will explode on impact. Now, the semiarmor-piercing shell that explodes on impact has been for many years practically laid upon the shelf and entirely out of use, and it seems to be outside of the range of contemplation by our experts, who have been trying to get something with which to defend this country.

The time is coming when the experience of the world in warfare, both in the Russo-Japanese war and, I think, in the present war, will have demonstrated that a shell which explodes upon impact is effective. There is in process of experimentation and perfection a shell which is worthy of sincere attention. It is intended to strike the water before it gets to the ship, if it can not hit the ship, and then run upon the water for quite a distance and not ricochet from the water over the ship, but run upon the surface of the water and then sink, and shortly after it sinks explode near enough to the hull of the ship, if it is properly placed, so that the explosion will blow in that portion of the vessel under the water line which is not as well protected as the part over the water. The recent successful experiment in this line was with the Isham torpedo shells. Thus there are three shells.

It has been demonstrated, as I have said, that the armor-piercing shell does not pierce at the battle range of 6 nautical miles, or 12,000 yards. We have observed that it does not, notwithstanding the experiments with varied charges of powder at Indianhead and on shorter ranges. As far as I am concerned, taking into consideration the supply of 12-inch or other armor-piercing shells that we have on hand now, I think it well to instruct the department not to purchase—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. BATHRICK. I am perfectly willing to instruct the department that no part of this appropriation shall be used for purchasing 12-inch shells or larger of the A. P. type, unless the manufacturers can demonstrate that they are effective at the medium battle range of 12,000 yards. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has perfected his amendment, which I hope he will submit in lieu of the one he first introduced, so it will overcome the objections that were made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], that it would prevent the department buying any kind of shell until the A. P. shell is perfected.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What do the manufacturers agree to do in that respect?

Mr. BATHRICK. That is a matter we are coming to. We insist they shall improve these shells, and we want more work put on explosive, or torpedo, shells.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I should like to have the gentleman from Tennessee conclude, and then I will close on this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that under the rule the chairman of the committee has the right to conclude the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The chairman of the committee has the right to close. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], who has two minutes remaining.

Mr. HOBSON. Three minutes, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman had six minutes, and yielded four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK]. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that no American really knows what other nations are doing along this line. They are keeping everything secret. Of course, we know that they have used an A. P. type of shell for a long time. They have probably developed their A. P. type to a higher degree of efficiency than ours.

It is a mistake to say that we are furnishing the ships of the Navy with semi-A. P. shells. The semi-A. P. shell has not been issued to ships for years and years. Those that were fired the other day had been brought from a magazine where they had been for 20 years. To-day we are completely dependent on the A. P. shell. Under my amendment, if the A. P. shell is found effective then we can continue to spend the appropriation for them. If it is not effective we could not. Why should we spend any more money for them if they are not effective? We can develop another kind of shell. We can improve this type of shell. Heretofore improvements have been slow. There is practically no competition among producers and manufacturers and little experimentation on the part of the Government. I am perfectly willing to limit this amendment to 12-inch shells and over, and I will offer that amendment when the time comes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with doing everything possible for the high-explosive shell, and yet I am afraid if the gentleman's amendment is adopted we shall not be able to get armor-piercing shells for 12-inch guns for use on ranges of less than 12,000 yards if, by any chance, a battleship of the United States is engaged in action.

Mr. HOBSON. We have a vast supply—of course the chairman might question the use of the word "vast"—but we have a large supply of ineffective shells, and I do not want to increase that supply. We can not fight effectively at battle ranges, and if we can not fight at battle ranges with the armor-piercing shell, we ought to know it and develop the use of the torpedo shell, which has reached the point where it can be used effectively. We ought not to send good after bad—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. HOBSON. I do not think it would be fair to take the five minutes on this amendment. The gentleman was granted time on another matter, and I appreciate his courtesy. Perhaps the gentleman can give me some of his time in discussing other matters, but I understood that on this particular amendment the time has been limited.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The statement of the gentleman from Alabama is correct.

Mr. HOBSON. I appreciate the offer, but I can not accept it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, as soon as the debate on this amendment is disposed of, can not we dispose of the amendment before we take up the other proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]? I think that would be the better practice.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Tennessee will indulge the Chair, he has three minutes remaining on this amendment, and he has five minutes reserved for the other.

Mr. PADGETT. I know that, but I wanted to know if we can not dispose of this amendment before we take up the other matters.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter for unanimous consent.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, I will ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the three minutes we vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if it was not the understanding that the question of what is called "mine explosives" and "mine effects," which bears on the use of the torpedo shell that will run under the water and explode under water—if it was not stated that that was to be the subject matter of discussion?

Mr. GARDNER. I was going to move to strike out the last word on that, because we could not get at the situation to which I object by any motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair is informed that there are five minutes reserved to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], and five minutes to the chairman of the committee on another proposition. The request of the gentleman from Tennessee was that at the expiration of three minutes the committee should vote on his amendment.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. HOBSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. If the Chairman will refer to his own record, he will find that the request for unanimous consent—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOBSON. There can be but one parliamentary inquiry at a time.

Mr. MANN. I am making the point of order that the gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated the parliamentary status.

Mr. HOBSON. I know, Mr. Chairman; but the request for unanimous consent was that 50 minutes' debate should be entered into and apportioned in such-and-such a way, when debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto should be considered as closed, and that was the unanimous-consent request that was granted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair is informed, there is a distinct understanding as to debate on this particular amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. There is no question about the matter on the debate. The debate on this amendment is to close in three minutes, which the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee is to have; but the question of taking the vote on this amendment before we know what the other matters are to be discussed, that question was not involved. The question for unanimous consent was that all debate should continue for 50 minutes, and then close on this amendment and all other amendments, and a variation from that would require unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Just what does the gentleman from Alabama want to get at?

Mr. HOBSON. I do not know just what is going to be said by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I do not know what is going to be said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], but I believe that this discussion will have a direct bearing on the merits of this amendment.

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee for three minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I can add but very little to what I have said. This proposed amendment would be hazardous to the Navy. It proposes to stop the purchase of all armor-piercing shells that are used by the navies of all countries in the world that have navies, when we are informed by the men who have the best information on the subject that our shells are as good if not better than those of all other countries; when all other countries are using principally armor-piercing shells, and when they are buying largely armor-piercing shells from factories in this country where we buy ours.

And yet the gentleman proposes to stop the purchase of shells and leave the Navy without the use of shells, whether we can use them in 10,000 or 6,000 yards, if his project is not carried out to his satisfaction.

The idea to me seems preposterous, that under the conditions existing, with the situation we have before us, when we need these shells, when they are the best of the kind, when they are the standard shells of the world, for us to attempt to stop the purchase and hazard the safety of the country. I call for a vote.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBSON. Is a vote now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. A vote is in order now under the agreement, as the present occupant of the chair understands.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to my amendment. After the word "Navy" insert the words "of 12-inch caliber or larger."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to do that?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to my own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not offer an amendment to his amendment at this time.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the pending amendment:

"Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of armor-piercing shells of 12-inch caliber or larger unless such shells are found by tests to be able to penetrate 10-inch Kruppized plates without breaking up the shell, fired with a standard service powder charge at an actual range of 12,000 yards."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama as amended by the substitute of the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PADGETT) there were—ayes 65, noes 39.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. PADGETT and Mr. HOBSON to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 55, noes 44.

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after the figures "\$5,195,420," in line 17, insert:

"Provided, That no part of said sum shall be used for the purchase or manufacture of armor-piercing shells until \$250,000 shall have been used for the purchase or manufacture of high-explosive shells.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offered a like amendment and discussed it at the last session of this Congress and had all the authorities here and presented them. It is a limitation upon the appropriation. All of the authorities universally, so far as I was able to find at that time, held that an amendment which was a limitation upon an appropriation was not subject to a point of order. I do not have the authorities with me at this time, because I did not think it would be disputed that a limitation upon the appropriation was subject to a point of order. This amendment, in effect, provides that the amount which is carried in this paragraph for armament shall not be used for the purchase of armor-piercing shells until \$250,000 have been used for the purchase of high-explosive shells, which is a limitation upon the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, while it is true that this amendment starts out in the form of a limitation, yet it is not offered as a limitation. It is not in effect a limitation. The purpose is to control the discretion of the department and direct the department to purchase \$250,000 worth of shells of a particular kind. That is not a limitation. That is a direction, a positive direction.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] offered a like amendment to an appropriation bill at a former session of Congress, and it was held that it was a limitation and was not subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do not remember whether that was the case or not. The gentleman ought to have his authorities here if that be the case.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is not a fact that I offered a like amendment at the last session of Congress to this same paragraph and if the point of order was not interposed and overruled?

Mr. MANN. I do not recall; but if that is the case the gentleman ought to have the record here to show it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if he did not sit at the time as chairman—

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that I did not, because I was a very humble member of the minority during the entire Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. FOWLER. But the gentleman does not let me finish the inquiry. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that he sat as chairman of a like committee when the Hobson amendment was offered to this one, and if he did not overrule the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do not think I did, and if I did I am ashamed of such a ruling. I would like to see the gentleman produce the ruling. I do not think I ever made such a ruling.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. FOWLER. No; the gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. MANN. Probably if I was in the chair, I held a proper amendment in order. I dare say I did hold an amendment in order, but I defy the gentleman to produce an amendment I did hold in order like this one.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been ruled that an amendment may be offered and is in order as a limitation. While this amendment apparently is a limitation upon an appropriation, it includes a positive enactment which establishes a rule for the department to follow, and therefore is legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad for the Chair to read the ruling at the last session of Congress on an amendment of this same character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not the time to look up all these rulings—

Mr. FOWLER. I know that is true.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). But the Chair read the ruling in the last Congress, and finds the Chair at that time overruled the point of order. But the Chair, while very much averse to differ with the chairman of the committee who presided over the Committee of the Whole last year, yet feels constrained, after looking up the matter as carefully as possible, to rule otherwise.

Mr. FOWLER. I had at that time an amendment just like one offered by Capt. Hobson at a session of Congress the session before, which I presented to the Chair at that time, and read it, and I think the amendment itself is in the proceedings.

Mr. MANN. Is the Chair still holding the point of order under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois, was trying to find the ruling of the Chair on this amendment at the last session. The Chair sustained the point of order, and recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER], under the agreement, for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to enter a motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized, under the agreement, for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to congratulate this House upon the action which it has just taken. In my opinion it is the wisest step which has been taken in naval affairs since I became a Member of the House four years ago. I became a student of naval affairs soon after I was elected, and I have devoted a large part of my spare time to the study of this question. I have consulted with experts, I have gone to experiments, and I have read the history of experiments for the last 15 years upon the question of armor plate and upon the question of shells. I have come to the conclusion from reading the authorities on military affairs that an armor-piercing shell falls far short of the contention of the inventor of the shell and of those who advocate it. It has been laid down by the writers upon shells that the armor-piercing shell is helpless beyond 8,000 to 10,000 yards, and the passage of the Hobson amendment just now is in the right direction, and it means that if the armor-piercing shell can not be perfected so that it can be utilized as a successful missile its death knell has been sounded by the vote here to-day. If there is anything which has been demonstrated by the conflict raging in the East it is that superiority in naval engagements consists, first, in the speed of the vessel, and, second, the high-explosive shell thrown from the big gun. The effect of the bombardment at the siege of Liege surely is enough to convince all intelligent readers that that mighty fort was destroyed by high-explosive shells, not shells filled with black powder, but shells filled with a much more deadly and much more highly explosive material than powder. That these shells, which have been used and are now being used by every one of the warring powers in the East, are far superior to the armor-piercing shell no one can doubt, and in the face of our own experiments here in America and the experiments which have been made by other countries and the lesson that we are learning to-day from the European war, how can the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs doubt but what he has been mistaken all the past years of his service in this House when he has stood firmly by and fought the battles for the armor-piercing shell? How can he say that the armor-piercing shell is superior to any other shell manufactured in the world?

The battle at Tsushima was a battle between the armor-piercing shell and the high-explosive shell, and the armor-piercing shell had behind it superior guns and twice as many

battleships, whereas the high-explosive shell had behind it much inferior guns and only one-half as many battleships, and yet the David, the little Japanese Fleet, with the high-explosive shell, felled the Goliath Russian Fleet and sent him to the bottom of the sea. That was a contest between American inefficiency on the question of shells and the eastern efficiency upon shells, for we had furnished Russia her shells. Mr. Chairman, I witnessed a demonstration last Wednesday which, in my opinion, stands at the top of all experiments with shells. It is within the reach of America to reach out her hand and take advantage of that great improvement in shells, and if we as Representatives fail to do this I fear that that invention may fall into the hands of other countries and be used to our great detriment in the future should we be so unfortunate as to be drawn into naval engagements with any of the great powers of the East. My term of service will soon end here in the House, but I never have seen a moment that was so glorious and so gratifying to me as the hour and the time when the Chair announced from the rostrum that an advanced step had been taken for America and for the American Navy. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, on last Wednesday I witnessed an experiment with a semiarmor-piercing shell in its flight of 10,000 yards through the air and its contact with the water. It exploded instantly on hitting the water, having nothing behind it except a small charge of black powder, and the fragments flew into the air, which proved that it was ineffective as an explosive against the side of a vessel; whereas, on the other hand, I witnessed an experiment at the same time with a high-explosive shell, the result of which was highly satisfactory to all present. Its marvelous results indicate that the warship supplied with it would hold a decided advantage over her enemy in naval engagements. If all of the Members of this House could have witnessed this experiment, I have no doubt but what Congress would go still further and provide for the purchase of this new shell, so that our Navy might be supplied with this marvelous invention.

Tell me that the ingenuity of America will not be accepted by an intelligent Congress when we find our Navy perfectly helpless in her projectiles! The vote just now taken on the Hobson amendment, to the effect that no more armor-piercing shells will be bought unless it can be demonstrated that the armor-piercing shell can be improved so that it will penetrate a 10-inch armor 12,000 yards away, answers this question.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am so overjoyed because of the magnificent victory which I witnessed last Wednesday, and the swift victory following it here on the floor of the House, that I am willing to divide my time with other gentlemen, so they may have an opportunity to express their views. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], reserving the other five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I am highly gratified at the half step the Committee of the Whole has just taken in adopting the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson]. For six years I have been working intermittently in the endeavor to have made experiments with high-power explosive shell as a competitor to the A. P. shell, as it is called. I do not know what influence it is in the Navy Department, Mr. Chairman, that has prevented what I call a bona fide test with these high-power explosive shells, but I know the experiments have been very, very slow, and the reports, for some reason or other, have not been satisfactory. And yet six years ago it became apparent that these A. P. shells would not penetrate armor plate of a certain thickness, and it seemed to me it was a contest between the armor-plate people to see if they could make armor plate that an A. P. shell could not penetrate, while the A. P. shell makers were doing their best to make a shell that could penetrate armor plate. And it was at least suspicious, Mr. Chairman, that the armor-plate people and the A. P. shell people did not want any innovation in the nature of an explosive shell, because if that shell becomes more effective than the piercing shell the armor-plate people and the A. P. shell both will be practically eliminated at once. But whether that is true or not, Mr. Chairman, I contend that the Navy Department ought to have long ago, if it has not done it already, make a bona fide test to see what efficacy there is in the high-power explosive shell, and let the country know it and let this House know it. We have been for six years, in my recollection, trying to get the Navy Department to make these simple tests, and I understand they are making some of them now. For my part, I would like to see the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois adopted, requiring the Navy

Department to expend \$250,000 at least in making a sincere, bona fide test, in order to ascertain the efficiency of these explosive shells. I made an effort to get such an amendment adopted long ago.

I heard a lecturer yesterday describing the effect of the German 42-centimeter or high-power shell when it hit the ground. It became necessary for the Germans to place 42-centimeter shells in front of one of the most impregnable forts. The shells were placed with wonderful accuracy. Well, on the occasion of his visit the lecturer went to the ground where the shells had fallen and exploded, and there he found, with great regularity, five different indentures in the earth, each of them 61 feet in diameter, 183 feet in circumference, and 23 feet deep, cut out with the form of a well-shaped funnel, with no earth around it and no dust about it. The power of that explosive shell had blown the dust and dirt into the air, as it were, and out into the wheat fields and the forest. If that can be done, I contend that the Navy Department, which has been spending thousands and millions of dollars every year for penetrating shells and other experiments, ought at least to spend a few dollars in experiments with shells to be exploded on the outside of a battleship, which many experts contend will make it unnecessary to purchase armor-piercing shells.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say that the Navy Department is using that high explosive that you refer to in the armor-piercing shell. It is the highest explosive known.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman says they are using the explosive in the armor-piercing shell. Then, why it is that they are so insistent and wedded to the use of the armor-piercing shell? Why do not they make a test of the high-explosive shell? I contend that the Navy Department ought to make some such experiments, and as long as I have a seat in this House I shall insist that they shall make a fair, bona fide test of such shells for the benefit of the people and of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this question of torpedo shells has reached the development stage, though, of course, experimentation has not ended. A little further on, on the next page of the bill, we shall reach the question of the provision for ordnance experiments. It has been cut down from \$150,000 last year to \$100,000 this year. When we reach that point in the bill I propose to offer an amendment to raise the \$100,000 to \$200,000, so that we can continue and expand these most valuable experiments. But we have really, Mr. Chairman, reached the point where the purchase of a limited number for use would be advantageous. Before the end of next fiscal year, and probably sooner, it will be advantageous and wise to expend this amount for this type of shell. I do not know that the wording of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Fowler] is the best. The Army torpedo shell rather than the high-explosive shell would be better perhaps, but the object is the same. Successful torpedo shells are now near realization in our country. In all probability torpedo shells are now in use in the navies abroad and in the armies as well.

If we give due encouragement to our inventors, there are certain elements of our shell that will make it superior to the torpedo shell of other countries. We should keep it superior to other torpedo shells. The time has about come when this torpedo shell ought to be included in our appropriation bills. Now, I realize that the provision of the bill itself permits of the purchase of torpedo shells as well as other types of shells. The discretion of the department ordinarily is all that should be required for making a choice or an allotment between types, leaving the appropriation in a general provision, allowing the department to purchase the shells that it regarded as best.

But I confess, Mr. Chairman, that my experience as chairman of the special Subcommittee on Ordnance Experiments of the Naval Committee, extending now over several years, has convinced me that the Bureau of Ordnance is loath to make any purchase of torpedo shells and is loath to make any experiment with torpedo shells. It is much to be regretted.

Such an amendment as is proposed would be the equivalent of a coercion upon the Bureau of Ordnance. That is what it would mean, coercion as to the expenditure of the \$250,000. Under the amendment there would be no option for the bureau for this amount. While it would be with reluctance, I would vote for such an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to get some information from the chairman of the committee, if possible. Admiral Fiske, in his evidence, on page 1007 of the hearings, says:

I think, of course, it is very well known that we are behind other nations; for instance, the two great naval nations of Europe, in the matter of mines and aircraft. I think that in the case of an attack on our coast by one of those powers our inadequacy would be very keenly felt.

Now, can the gentleman tell me, as a matter of fact, what various different items in the naval appropriation bill the appropriations for mines are drawn from? I understand there are two or three different items under which mines can be provided. How do we stand, as a matter of fact, in the matter of the mines which are under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department?

Mr. PADGETT. The mines are provided for under the appropriation for "Ordnance and ordnance stores."

Mr. GARDNER. Well, it was testified last year by Admiral Strauss that they also could be appropriated for and the money used under "Armor and armament."

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. How many more subdivisions are there where appropriations for mines are tucked away?

Mr. PADGETT. Those are the only two that I recall at present.

Mr. GARDNER. How much are you appropriating for mines this year?

Mr. PADGETT. It is embraced in the lump-sum appropriations, in these two appropriations; in the \$5,795,420 appropriated for ordnance and ordnance stores.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman give me any idea as to how much you are appropriating for mines in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No. There is no specific estimate submitted for mines. They submitted a total estimate to take care of the mines as well as the other items, but there was no specific estimate submitted for mines.

Mr. GARDNER. Can the gentleman tell me what mines we have got in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; I could do so, but I do not think it would be proper to make it public. I will make this statement, however, that the Navy Department had on hand a certain number of mines, and the General Board, of which Admiral Fiske was a member, recommended that we should have a given number in addition to that, and thereupon that additional number was ordered and is now being constructed at the navy yard at Norfolk, and when that number that was ordered is completed we shall have 50 more than the General Board recommended as the proper number to have.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, does that include all sorts of mines—the \$70 cheap mines and the anchor mines?

Mr. PADGETT. Those are the expensive mines; the large mines.

Mr. GARDNER. What did Admiral Fiske mean by his evidence, then?

Mr. PADGETT. I am unable to say. Admiral Fiske was a member of the General Board. The General Board recommended that there should be a given number, and thereupon the department ordered the number that it would be necessary to get to make that number, added to what we had on hand; as a matter of fact, 50 more than that number.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman. Now, as a matter of fact, the Army has furnished me a statement as to the mines which they have on hand for seacoast defense. If the Army can reveal not only how many mine cases they have on hand, but also how many mines, the Navy can afford to do the same thing.

Now I am going to read some more from Admiral Fiske's evidence. Admiral Fiske says:

For carrying and laying mines we have the *San Francisco*, a vessel of about 4,000 tons. She has, I think, 336 mines, mines not of the most modern type, but still good for use. That is all we have at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman three minutes out of my five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. GARDNER. I will try to get through with less. Now, referring to Admiral Fiske's words there, I assume he refers to mine-laying ships when he says "That is all we have at present."

Mr. PADGETT. Let me call this to the gentleman's attention: The department ordered and has under construction at the present time at the Norfolk Navy Yard 2,200 mines, which is in



addition to the number which I did not state which was on hand.

Mr. GARDNER. And when will they be finished?

Mr. PADGETT. They are commencing the delivery in the present month.

Mr. GARDNER. And when will they be finished? Within two years?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say exactly, but within a few months.

Mr. GARDNER. The whole of them?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. How are those mines going to be laid? Here is an extract from page 1001 of the hearings:

Mr. ROBERTS. How many of the mine-laying ships should we have?

Admiral FISKE. We have the *San Francisco*.

Mr. ROBERTS. How many should we have?

Admiral FISKE. Germany has five, I believe.

Mr. ROBERTS. Do you think we should have five?

Admiral FISKE. I think so.

Mr. ROBERTS. Should we have more than that?

Admiral FISKE. Yes; I should think so. Our coast is very much longer than Germany's coast. I should think we should have more than that.

Has there been any step taken by the committee to remedy that situation?

Mr. PADGETT. No. There are a number of types of ships that can be used for the purpose of laying mines. There are other ships that are recommended that are more essential and more important, and the committee has provided for that class of ships when we can use other ships that we have for mine laying.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman knows that Admiral Fiske does not agree with him on that point?

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Fiske does not disagree with the idea that they can be used.

Mr. GARDNER. No. He says they are not appropriate for any other Navy purpose, if fitted for mine laying.

Mr. PADGETT. He says the ones they use are better.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, one moment further. I read:

Mr. ROBERTS. Would we need a special appropriation to bear the expense for an extensive development along that line?

Admiral FISKE. I believe Germany spent \$500,000 in 1913 on mines. They are supposed to have about 20,000 mines. How close those figures are to the actual facts I do not know. That is what I hear. I have a good many sources of information, and I am under the impression that they have 20,000 mines.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the mines. You were talking about the ships.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but I was taking his evidence in the order in which it appears in the hearings.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any statement further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder, \$1,150,000: *Provided*, That no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be expended for the purchase of powder other than small-arms powder at a price in excess of 53 cents a pound: *Provided further*, That in expenditures of this appropriation, or any part thereof, for powder, no powder shall at any time be purchased unless the powder factory at Indianhead, Md., shall be operated on a basis of not less than its full maximum capacity.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 17, in line 6, by striking out the figures "53" at the end of said line and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "50."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the interest of economy. It has been demonstrated that we manufacture powder at a cost of from 30 to 34 cents. In fact, I believe we can manufacture it for less than that. We have been paying 53 cents for the last three years for the powder that we purchase. As I recollect, prior to that time we had been paying a much larger sum, as high perhaps as 80 or 85 cents per pound. It is to the credit of some Members, and especially the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] who is chairman of the subcommittee on coast defenses, that a reduction has been made in the purchase price of this powder. If we can manufacture powder at a cost of 30 to 35 cents a pound, then the difference between that and 53 cents a pound is an exceedingly large profit. That is nearly double. If we could manufacture it for 26½ cents a pound, then the price that we are now paying would be exactly double.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman think that in the present state of affairs, when powder is so much in demand, it is rather dangerous to put a maximum price on it?

Mr. FOWLER. We have already fixed a maximum price at 53 cents. We have done that to my recollection in the last three bills, or at least in the last two, and my recollection is in the last three. Now, if it has been demonstrated that powder can be manufactured for from 30 to 35 cents a pound, then the difference between that price and 53 cents a pound is an exorbitant profit, which ought not to be imposed upon the people of this country. We represent individual districts primarily, and at large we represent America. That being the case, it becomes our duty to see that no company or combination of companies shall impose upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BROWNING. I should just like to ask the gentleman whether it costs any less to manufacture powder now than it did three years ago, when this proviso was put in the bill?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I think not.

Mr. BROWNING. Then why should we reduce it?

Mr. FOWLER. We reduced it then, because we had not, as I recollect, determined exactly what the cost of the production of powder was.

Mr. BROWNING. I think the gentleman will find he is very much mistaken in what he says the cost of Government manufacture is.

Mr. FOWLER. No; I am not mistaken. If I were mistaken about it then I would feel ashamed to offer this amendment; but knowing my ground I feel certain that the amount which we are now paying for powder is exorbitant, and I do not think, in the light of the information which we have received during the last five years concerning the cost of the manufacture of powder, that we can justify ourselves in voting to pay to any corporation or any trust in this country 53 cents a pound.

Mr. BROWNING. If the gentleman will look at the hearings before the Naval Committee, I think he will find it was testified by Admiral Strauss that the powder manufactured by the Government cost it about 44 cents a pound.

Mr. FOWLER. I know what the testimony has been heretofore. I know it has been that it cost about 34 cents a pound, instead of 44 cents a pound, and I believe it can be manufactured at a much less cost than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The figures as to the cost of manufacture are obtained only from the Government manufacture, are they not?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that the powder manufacturers, known as the Powder Trust, have never permitted an examination of their books; that they have refused it, and that the probability is that they are manufacturing it for very much less than the Government is, owing to the fact that the Government pays about 25 per cent higher wages, giving annual leave and other privileges to the working people that the Powder Trust does not?

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that is largely true, Mr. Chairman; and for that reason and others I have seen fit to offer this amendment. I do not think there is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee who will dispute that the Government is now manufacturing powder at not to exceed 34 cents a pound and that we are paying, according to the law which is on the statute books, the sum of 53 cents a pound, which ought not to be the case. The difference between 34 cents and 53 cents is too great. It runs up to nearly 100 per cent, and 10 per cent is considered a handsome profit on any investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the limitation fixed in this bill is the same as is fixed in the Army appropriation bill. Congress has kept the two services upon the same basis. I agree fully with the suggestion made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], that this is not the time to fix a price limitation so low that we might not be able to get powder if we needed it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do they not take off the maximum limitation of 53 cents and leave it open?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we keep it as we had it last year and as the House has fixed it this year in the Army appropriation bill, which has preceded our bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Then you are in favor of the limitation?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Then you can not agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Illinois made a very positive statement about the cost of powder, and said it was from 30 to 35 cents. The committee went into that matter with Admiral Strauss, and the cost of powder, as will be found on page 200 of the hearings, was thirty-six and a fraction cents a pound, and that did not include any allowance for interest on the investment, nor does it include any allowance for taxes, and there are other matters that enter into the cost of powder by the powder manufacturer that is not expressed in these items. So that the gentleman's statement is below the figures given by Admiral Strauss.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois) there were 11 ayes and 31 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The item that provides for the Government to run the Indianhead powder mill to its full capacity was an amendment that I offered in the House, and was my first effort in Congress. It passed the House, but was squeezed out in the conference between the two Houses. At that time it seemed to be dangerous for the Government to extend its powder plant and manufacture its own powder, because it was thought that the Powder Trust would go out of business and refuse to manufacture it unless they could be satisfied with the amount of their contract and the amount of the profit that they desired. Of course these trusts, especially the large ones that have been proved guilty of violations of the law are very modest in their requests and demands for profit. We have now just voted down an amendment that provided for reducing the price of powder from 53 to 50 cents, which would give a fair profit to the Powder Trust, but if there was an effort made to increase wages or something of that sort we would hear a great many cry out for economy. This amendment would have probably saved the Government quite a good deal of money. There is no doubt but that there is sufficient profit for the powder manufacturer. If this trust is so powerful as to be dangerous unless we satisfy them, if we are not going to have their powder, probably there would be other manufacturers that would be glad to make a sale of powder at a fair price and a fair profit.

There is no doubt in my mind that private powder manufacturers are manufacturing powder for even less than the Government reports that it cost them to make the powder. While it is true we have had the representative of the Powder Trust before the committee, and he makes it appear that it costs 44 or 45 cents a pound, yet while it is said that figures do not lie, sometimes liars figure, and it is the general custom of these trusts, especially those that have little regard for the law except to keep out of its toils, not to have much regard for truth.

So it is that we do not know the facts. They have refused to show their books; they have refused to let experts of the Government who want to get at the facts as to the cost of these things see what it has cost them; they prefer to see the head of the company, or some one who will not give away their methods and the cost, come before the committee and make explanations. They have always refused to open their books and give the facts in regard to the cost of the manufacture of war munitions.

Instead of the 50 cents that you have just voted down being too small, in my judgment it is too large. There is one gratification about it, and that is that Government powder manufacturing is being extended and becoming much more efficient from the fact that the Government has undertaken to manufacture it. When the people wake up to the fact that they are being plundered by these corporations, they are going to demand of their Representatives that they will support measures that will permit the Government to manufacture all of its war munitions, so that you can have the best and the cheapest that there is, and give working men the best conditions by permitting them to have a part in the industry. We know that under Government employment workingmen get better conditions, more wages, get annual leave, get sick leave, and still find the cost of the manufacture of the war munitions much less than it can be

purchased or contracted for. Still we find great opposition, as a rule, to extending our plants or establishing plants for the manufacture of munitions of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question and ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's time will be extended for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if two years ago the Naval Committee did not report in favor of enlarging the plant at Indianhead in order to make more powder, and if the gentleman did not file a minority report against the enlargement of the powder plant at Indianhead?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I never was opposed to an enlargement of the powder mill in any capacity that would be necessary to manufacture the powder that the Government needs.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he, in writing, filed a minority report protesting against the enlargement of the powder plant at Indianhead, stating specifically that it was large enough to manufacture all the powder we needed.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Was that true?

Mr. PADGETT. It was not; and we enlarged it over the gentleman's protest and his minority report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I signed a minority report, which in the main, of course, I was in favor with, one year ago, to prevent the building of useless battleships, because the only benefit they are to give a few men work and the armor-plate ring about \$2,000,000 profit to every battleship that is built. If we could stop that useless expenditure of money, perhaps we would have in our plant at Indianhead sufficient capacity to manufacture what powder we need. That was one of the things that the minority was in favor of at that time; but I would like to say to the chairman of my committee, who is a lovable gentleman, that it was over his protest that I secured the passage of an amendment—I think it was four years ago—which provided for the extension of the powder mill, and perhaps he did not exercise his efforts very strongly to keep it in the bill when in conference. Therefore it was squeezed out; so it might be asked of him whether in that conference at that time, when this amendment to increase the capacity for the Government to operate that factory to full capacity—whether or not he did, in representing this House in conference, exercise his influence as he should have exercised it to keep the amendment in. Due to the fact that we did not keep it in, we did not have this sort of legislation for a year afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Not being a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I am obliged to rely in considerable measure on the good judgment of that committee to guide me in my vote on propositions of this kind. But at this point I desire to call attention to certain testimony concerning the cost of making powder, a subject which seems to be in dispute here. On page 207 of the hearings I find the following:

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask you if you can put in the hearings a statement as to the cost of manufacturing powder?

Admiral STRAUSS. The powder for this year?

The CHAIRMAN. I mean for the fiscal year ending June 30.

Admiral STRAUSS. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the cost, including all overhead charges, administration, etc., was \$0.38072 per pound. That is, about 38 cents.

Mr. BROWNING. Does that include packing?

Admiral STRAUSS. That includes everything—the packing, tug service—

Mr. BROWNING. And freight?

Admiral STRAUSS. And freight. It includes everything that is incident to the production of powder at Indianhead.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it embrace the administration charges of the force that may be used here in Washington?

Admiral STRAUSS. It does not embrace the cost of clerical work here in the department.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate that to be, or have you an estimate of what that would be, if added?

Admiral STRAUSS. Oh, it would be a very small amount, the pay of one clerk and part of the pay of one officer, so far as the Bureau of Ordnance is concerned—

Mr. ROBERTS. It would be a small part of a cent?

Admiral STRAUSS. A very small fraction of a cent.



He was then questioned about insurance, and replied that the Government plant insured itself. Then Mr. ROBERTS, of that committee, took up the inquiry as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS. Does it include interest on capital?

Admiral STRAUSS. Yes, sir; we have allowed 3 per cent on the plant value and the stock in suspension. That is included.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say 3 cents or 3 per cent?

Admiral STRAUSS. Three per cent on our total investment—that is, buildings and machinery—

Mr. ROBERTS (interposing). And land?

Admiral STRAUSS. Land and stock in suspension. The investment in land is very small.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you include the value of the plant at?

Admiral STRAUSS. We estimate the plant value to be \$1,278,870.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you include for stock in suspension?

Admiral STRAUSS. The stock in suspension is estimated at \$1,010,000. That includes materials for the manufacture of powder and powder not yet completed.

On page 211 I find the following:

Mr. BROWNING. As I understand you, Admiral, the stability of the powder produced by the Government and that bought from private manufacturers is about the same?

Admiral STRAUSS. I think it is about the same.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the difference in the cost?

Admiral STRAUSS. Last year our total cost for powder produced at Indianhead was about 38 cents, and we purchased it at 53 cents.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Proving Ground, Indianhead, Md.: For machinery for extension of powder factory, to be available until expended, \$141,620.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 17, strike out the figures "\$141,620" and insert in lieu thereof "\$350,000: Provided, That \$200,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, be used for the construction of a Government plant for the manufacture of high-explosive shells."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I concede that if the chairman of the committee or any other gentleman desires to interpose a point of order against the proposition it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Torpedoes and appliances: For the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances, to be available until June 30, 1918, \$1,000,000.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is it the intention of the Naval Committee to provide torpedoes or to provide for money to manufacture torpedoes to be 21 feet in length and 21 inches in diameter for the use of submarines? In other words, are the long-range torpedoes to be made for submarines?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they are not. The submarines are not fitted to use that size torpedo. At submarine range the torpedo is not so large. They go up near the ship. The farther they are off, the smaller the angle and the greater the danger of missing, so they go up close to the ship to fire.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, I invite attention to the evidence of Admiral Fletcher. On pages 542-543 of the hearing, speaking of these long-range 21-foot torpedoes, Mr. WITHERSPOON asked:

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Now, what I want to ask you is: Are the latest submarines equipped with that torpedo?

Admiral FLETCHER. No; they are not equipped with that torpedo.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, can they be equipped with it?

Admiral FLETCHER. My impression is that they will be equipped with them eventually.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The highest grade of torpedo?

Admiral FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. There is no reason why the submarine should not have the same powerful torpedo that a battleship has, is there?

Admiral FLETCHER. No reason; but a long-range torpedo is not so essential on a submarine that can get close to a battleship.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit me just at that point?

Mr. GARDNER. In just a minute I will yield to the gentleman. Now, Admiral Strauss said, and the Secretary of the Navy quoted him when he made answer to something which I had not said, but which appeared in a morning newspaper—Admiral Strauss said that the *Aboukir*, the *Cressy*, and the *Hogue* were blown up at short range, and apparently he drew the inference that short-range torpedoes are all we need for our submarines. Mr. Chairman, the next bunch of ships will not be blown up at short range. Many a man has been killed with a revolver at short range, especially when he was not on his guard; but any sensible man would rather have a long-range weapon than a short-range weapon, if he was bent on the destruction of an enemy. Of course, it must be assumed that the long-range torpedo has high speed and power. I am afraid the great trouble is that Admiral Strauss does not want to

scrap his old short-range torpedoes. Let me read you from the admiral's own statement in his report made as Chief of Bureau of Ordnance before this agitation was begun. The report is dated September 23, 1914. Here is what the admiral says on page 8:

The torpedo situation is developing very satisfactorily with the exception of modern torpedoes for battleships anterior to the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma*. For cruisers of the *Tennessee* class and for the scouts—

Now, that is a formidable list of vessels he is describing—

At present all of these vessels are equipped with short-range torpedoes which may be considered obsolete for the battle fleet.

That statement was made before I began a discussion of the torpedo situation and before it became an issue. Now, Mr. Chairman, the admiral says that the battleships anterior to the *Nevada* and *Oklahoma* are all equipped with short-range torpedoes. The fact is that all our battleships are anterior to the *Nevada* and the *Oklahoma*. Neither of them has yet been completed. In other words, every battleship of the United States Navy is equipped with short-range torpedoes, which may be considered obsolete for the battle fleet, but the unpleasant fact is completely shrouded in that paragraph which I just read.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that we have established in this country a range of 4,000 yards as a proper range for the submarine torpedo and later the General Board has considered the matter very carefully, and they have reduced that range from 4,000 to 2,000 yards as a proper range for the torpedoes. And I may say further that the range that the board has established—that is, the reduced range—is twice the range of the submarines of countries in Europe, so that even with our reduced ranges we are twice the range of England, France, and Germany.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARDNER. How does the chairman know that?

Mr. PADGETT. I have a letter from Admiral Strauss.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman read that letter?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; I have no objection to putting it in the Record.

Mr. BUTLER. Let it be read.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, I want to state this about torpedoes: A great deal has been said about torpedoes. We have a full supply of torpedoes for every torpedo tube we have in submarines, torpedo boats, and battleships, including the ones that were authorized in the last bill.

That is, Congress has appropriated for and we have either on hand or ordered a full supply for every tube that we have up to and including the authorizations in the last bill, and in addition to that we have on hand and ordered a reserve equal to the supply for all of our tubes, lacking only six torpedoes. We had ordered from abroad seven torpedoes, known as the Fumi torpedo, which we were cut off from getting by reason of the war, and if we had had those seven we would have had one extra for all the tubes that we have.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, the gentleman is saying that we have the torpedoes needed according to the estimate of Admiral Strauss.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; it is the amount that has been fixed. There is no secret about it. I did not give the aggregate amount; but I have no objection—

Mr. BUTLER. I think the letter really ought to be read.

Mr. PADGETT. I will read it in a few minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I would like to have it read in a few minutes; but I would like to ask, counting in all your short-range torpedoes, how many does that give for each torpedo tube on the fleet.

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I am coming to right now. In the vessels of the *Ohio* class, 3 of them, the full or supply is 24 torpedoes, or 8 torpedoes for each ship. Each torpedo has a fill with that type of ship. Of ships of the *Virginia* class there are 5, and 16 torpedoes is a full or supply for that class of ship. The *Connecticut* class is 18. The *Michigan*, the *Delaware*, the *Florida*, and the *Wyoming* class is 12. The *Texas* and the *Oklahoma* class is 16, and the *Pennsylvania* and the *California*—the *California* being the one authorized in the last bill—are 24 for a full or supply, and 24 being reserved would make 48 for each one for that class of ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more, that we may get information about these matters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, you take the cruisers. There are four of the cruisers that require 16 torpedoes each; there are other cruisers that require 8. All of the destroyers that run from 4 to 12 and the submarines, running from 3 to 14, have a fill. Now, then, as I stated, we have not only the complete fill but we have a complete reserve ordered and on hand, lacking 6, and if we had gotten the 7 that were ordered abroad we would have 1 surplus.

Now, the torpedoes that are being manufactured from the million dollars that was appropriated last year are the best types of torpedoes, and the million dollars that is provided in this bill is for the purpose of supplying and remaking and building up to it the older type of torpedoes that we have. In other words, some of the torpedoes are being made shorter in certain respects and with larger heads, in order to carry a larger quantity of high explosives. So this talk you have heard over the country about our torpedo situation is not correct.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman has had his time extended for five minutes, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended.

Mr. PADGETT. I join in the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. You stated a while ago that the board had reduced the range from 4,000 to 2,000 yards.

Mr. PADGETT. The fighting range.

Mr. HELM. I would like to have you make that a little clearer, inasmuch as it is somewhat hazy. In other words, they give instructions that a submarine should endeavor to get within 2,000 yards of the ship before firing?

Mr. PADGETT. They have not reduced the torpedo.

Mr. HELM. You and I are in a battle, or our ships are in a battle with the enemy, and they are going to stand where we tell them to stand. Is that the idea?

Mr. PADGETT. No; but the submarine is to endeavor to sail within 2,000 yards and fire.

Mr. HELM. Now they have only had to sail within 4,000 yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Four thousand yards was the limit that was fixed heretofore; so that 2,000 yards is twice the distance prescribed for England, France, and Germany.

Mr. HELM. In other words, so I understand you, good fighting requires you to be within 2,000 yards of an enemy before you will fire a torpedo?

Mr. PADGETT. No. Now, we started out with the torpedo at a 1,000-yard range. That was their running range. We have in a few years developed until we are manufacturing now torpedoes with a 10,000-yard limit, which is 6 sea miles, or nearly 7 land miles.

Now, I may say—and I am not giving away any secret—that we are developing a torpedo with a range of 13,500 yards. That does not mean, however, that when we get the torpedo with a range of 13,500 yards the 10,000-yard range torpedo is useless and a failure, and that in making the 10,000-yard torpedo now it does not mean that we will throw away the torpedo with a range of 7,000 yards that we made the year before last. They are still valuable and useful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more. I will then yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts some time.

Mr. GARDNER. I do not ask the gentleman for time. I ask the committee to yield time to me.

Mr. PADGETT. I will join in giving it to you. I want you to have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, you can realize at once that if you are firing at 10,000 yards, a little variation at the start with the torpedo will carry the torpedo wide of the mark at that range, but the same variation at a range of 2,000 yards would make very little difference. The angle broadens geometrically as the distance increases.

Now, then, the battleships and the submarines are equipped with those long-range torpedoes, because they fire them at long range. The submarine can submerge beneath the surface, with its periscope above, and can steam under the water and get up closer, so that the General Board has prescribed it as a regulation that they should endeavor to get within 2,000 yards and reduce to the minimum the angle of variation, so as to multiply very largely the chances of hitting.

Now, I yield the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question before he sits down?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, because it must be admitted by everybody that the statement as made by the gentleman is true, otherwise every time you sent a torpedo out from a ship it would sink the other ship, and that is why we have so many torpedo boats that do not sink ships. That is the reason why whole navies are not sunk by torpedo boats every 10 minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Before the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] takes the floor, Mr. Chairman, I desire to have the letter of Admiral Fiske read, and I will ask that it be read at the Clerk's desk, because my voice is not in good condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,  
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1915.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT, M. C.,  
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PADGETT—

1. In response to your request of yesterday I am submitting the following information concerning the torpedo situation:

2. We are building the longest-range torpedoes for all those vessels that, by reason of their construction, are able to take them, and are furnishing torpedoes of improved range for the older ships as fast as they can be turned out. A great many of the vessels already built have been supplied with the increased-range torpedo.

3. The torpedo station is using the million dollars appropriated at the last session in building these increased-range torpedoes; and if Congress appropriates the million asked for this year, that will be allotted to the torpedo station for the same purpose. We have three factories at work on torpedoes—the Bliss Co.'s large plant in Brooklyn, the growing plant at Newport, and last year, in order to further the manufacture of torpedoes in this country, we gave an order to the Washington Navy Yard.

4. No other source of supply is open to us. We had one foreign source of supply, but we did not consider the torpedoes manufactured by that firm equal to our own. We ordered seven trial torpedoes from another manufacturer in Europe some two years ago. They have never been delivered. However, we are fairly well off for torpedoes with respect to the number fixed upon by the General Board as an adequate supply. We are manufacturing great numbers, the majority of which are for ships now being built, and all of which will be ready when the ships are delivered to the Government.

5. Beginning with June, 1913, orders have been placed for torpedoes which to date nearly equal the total accumulation of torpedoes in the United States Navy up to that time. To be exact, for every 100 torpedoes on hand and ordered at that date 96 have been ordered since then.

6. Turning now to the question of torpedoes for submarines I desire to say that it is not now nor has it ever been contemplated that a submarine should fire as long a range torpedo as a surface vessel. The reason for this is so obvious that I will not go into it. Generally speaking, the error of a torpedo is in direct proportion to the distance it has to travel. Therefore an important element in the successful shot is, of course, as short a range as possible. The submarine is able to fire at shorter ranges, with a consequent greater hope of hitting, than a vessel exposed to the fire of the enemy.

7. With a battleship the torpedo is an auxiliary weapon and must await its chance to be used during the general engagement with guns, and a long-range torpedo is therefore necessary. The torpedo boat should have a long-range torpedo for the reason that torpedo vessels are particularly vulnerable, and in order to survive or even deliver their shot they are compelled to sacrifice some chance of hitting by firing at long range.

8. It is an advantage to reduce the size of torpedoes for submarines; and since this can be done with a sacrifice of useless range, it is a wise policy to have a reduced range for submarine torpedoes. On the other hand, if it is determined that the submarine torpedoes at present are not too large to be handy, by keeping the same dimensions the explosive charge can be largely increased. Very recently the General Board has recommended that this latter step be taken; that is, that the range of submarine torpedoes be reduced and the explosive charge increased. The range will still be very large as compared with the range of submarine torpedoes abroad. If we are to trust our information from abroad, the range of our submarine torpedoes, even when reduced, will be about twice that of the submarine torpedoes used in Germany, France, and England.

Respectfully,

J. STRAUSS,  
Chief of Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, out of the 520 torpedo tubes in the Navy only 112 are on submarines. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not designed to use 18-inch torpedoes on the new submarines? I think they call them "Mark 7," or something of the sort.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the 18-inch is to be used.

Mr. GARDNER. And what is the range of those 18-inch torpedoes?

Mr. PADGETT. I think they use only the 18-inch on the submarines.

Mr. GARDNER. And what is their range?

Mr. PADGETT. It is less than 4,000 yards. Some of them run up to 7,000.



Mr. GARDNER. It is between 4,000 and 7,000 yards, is it not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to criticize the Ordnance Department. I mean merely to state the facts. The mere fact that the Ordnance Department is not to blame or that it is doing the best it can, would not alter the situation if war were to break out to-morrow. I do not mean to say that the Ordnance Department is not justified in retaining old torpedoes of short range if they have none better; but, as a matter of fact, we do have a lot of short-range, out-of-date torpedoes, and I object to their being reckoned as if they were up-to-date torpedoes. I do not in the least care whose fault it is or whether it is anyone's fault. We have not got the goods. I do not mean to say that the Bureau of Ordnance has not supplied long-range torpedoes to all vessels which are fitted to receive them. I do not know whether they have or not. I do mean to say that, whether they are fitted to handle them or not, the fact remains that most of our ships are not fitted with the best torpedoes. I do not mean to say that the Ordnance Department is not supplying torpedoes as fast as they can be turned out, which the Admiral claims in his letter. I suppose, of course, that they are being supplied as fast as they can be turned out, but they can not be turned out fast enough with the appropriations which you have been allowing them to have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit a question just there?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I wanted to say that provision is made for supplying the vessels that have been authorized, and the letter of Admiral Strauss stated that the torpedoes would be ready at the time the vessel was completed. What is the use of completing the torpedoes in advance of the vessel?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; I am not saying that you can put long-range torpedoes on those old vessels. I am saying that the old vessels do not, as a matter of fact, have them, which is another illustration of the obsolescence of the second-line battle-ships.

Now, let us get down to these short-range torpedoes for the submarine fleet. I am now going to read something from Commander Stirling's evidence, on page 884 of the hearings. Commander Stirling commands the submarine flotilla. Mr. WITHERSPOON said:

Now, Commander, in regard to these 18 submarine boats on the Atlantic coast that you have described, are they all equipped with torpedoes that you say will shoot 5,000 yards?

As a matter of fact, there are only 12 submarines in commission on the Atlantic coast, unless you count the 5 at the Panama Canal. Mr. WITHERSPOON says:

Are they all equipped with torpedoes that you say will shoot 5,000 yards?

That is the 18-inch torpedo which the chairman says is desirable. Commander Stirling answered, "No, sir." Then I read further:

Mr. WITHERSPOON. How many of them are equipped with as powerful a torpedo as that?

Commander STIRLING. Four.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Only four?

Commander STIRLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that those old-fashioned submarines can be equipped with the best modern 18-inch submarine torpedoes. Very likely it is impossible. What I am pointing out is that they are not so equipped. From the point of view of our national defense it does not make the slightest difference what the cause is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. This item of a million dollars is made available until June 30, 1918, and the item immediately preceding, for ammunition for ships of the Navy, is made available until expended. Is the gentleman able to state what the balance is in the Treasury at any particular time of all the appropriations which have been made for ammunition for the ships of the Navy? In other words, for the current year the amount is \$3,178,890. Is that practically expended during the year, or is there a sum accumulating as a balance in the Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. My understanding is that it has been practically expended. For instance, on page 220 of the hearings Admiral Strauss states that, based on the bid in 1914, the expenditure amounts to \$2,782,535—

Mr. MANN. To cut it short, does the gentleman know what is the balance in the Treasury on this character of appropriations?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that there is an unexpended balance for projectiles at the present time of about \$800,000.

Mr. MANN. I am asking about the item of ammunition for ships of the Navy. What is the unexpended balance in the Treasury of that item at any time that the gentleman figures on?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I am trying to give the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is talking about projectiles.

Mr. PADGETT. They purchase projectiles.

Mr. MANN. I know, but I am talking about the item of ammunition for ships of the Navy, made available each year until expended, and I want to know whether they are accumulating a credit balance or whether they are expending the money.

Mr. PADGETT. They are expending the money each year, but this last year, on account of getting projectiles at a very reduced price, far less than they had ever gotten them for before, there was an unexpended balance of about \$800,000, so that this year the committee took that into consideration, and we did not appropriate as much as we had heretofore appropriated.

Mr. MANN. Then there is no occasion for making this item available until expended?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been the custom.

Mr. MANN. I know, but if it is being spent every year there is no occasion for putting in the bill the words "to be available until expended," so that no one can know how much has been expended and know how much of a credit balance they have unless he goes to the Treasury Department and looks at the figures. It is a very loose system of making appropriations, unless they want to have some money accumulate there, and if this amount is being expended every year, next year, when we reach this item, I will make a point of order on it.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think they are accumulating any fund there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments, Bureau of Ordnance: For experimental work in the development of armor-piercing and torpedo shell and other projectiles, fuses, powders, and high explosives, in connection with problems of the attack of armor with direct and inclined fire at various ranges, including the purchase of armor, powder, projectiles, and fuses for the above purposes and of all necessary material and labor in connection therewith, and for other experimental work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with the development of ordnance material for the Navy, \$100,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 17, strike out the figures "\$100,000" and insert "\$200,000"

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, for several years we have been making experiments under this appropriation through a subcommittee of our Committee on Naval Affairs. The experiments have related largely to the development of the torpedo shell. In this connection we experimented with the armor-piercing shell. Experiments along both lines ought to be continued. The experiments with the armor-piercing shell at long range involves placing on a platform of an old ship expensive armor plate.

Again, we should take up experiments to reduce the rolling of vessels in a seaway to produce a steady platform for our guns. There are indications that the German Navy has some such device, reputed to be a tank system, under which it can maintain a steady platform in a seaway. This seems to have been used in the fight off the Chilean coast, where the Germans in a half gale and heavy sea, at 12,000 yards, made excellent target practice against the English vessel, and although one English vessel had heavier guns, they seem to have made no hits at all. At all events, this line of experimentation ought to be taken up. It will involve a considerable expenditure. I do not think the addition of \$100,000 would be excessive.

We have heretofore allowed \$150,000. Last year and the year before it was \$150,000. It is the consensus of opinion of those connected with the experiments that no expenditure has given larger returns for the amount involved. It is a small amount compared with the total expenditure on the Navy, whose whole efficiency is affected. It will tend to make more effective the attacking power of our ships, whether using armor-piercing shells or torpedo shells.

In the Navy Department there is no agency provided by law for experimentation. The chiefs of the bureaus are loaded down with details of administration. This is the main cause of our being backward in experimentation and our relying mainly

upon experimentation and development abroad, causing us to follow instead of leading.

The present great war will certainly cause many improvements, many new lines of attack and defense, abroad, which will require extra experimentation for us to keep abreast of in this country. It would be a wise precaution to have a fund rather in excess of than short of the usual amount for experimentation.

I am hoping that the subcommittee of the House committee may be supplemented by a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs in the Senate, to make a joint subcommittee on naval experimentation, which will continually cooperate with a special board from the Navy Department.

Since the special board appointed by the Navy Department has taken up the experimental work, progress has been great. In the past progress has been limited, dependent as the work was on the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, burdened by administrative duties; but now a special board of officers has been appointed to conduct the experiments in connection with our subcommittee, and the results have been gratifying.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. If there ever was a time, Mr. Chairman, when we can eliminate expenditures for experimental purposes it does seem to me that this is the time and the occasion. With 20,000,000 men now under arms in Europe engaged in war and employing every conceivable instrument of warfare that has ever been invented—in the air, on the land, on the sea, under the sea—when every possible test of every character and kind is now being made in Europe, why the War Department and why the Navy Department can not content themselves for 6 months, or for a matter of 12 months, and see how these tests turn out, I can not conceive. We have simply acquired the habit of appropriating and can not stop it. Such appropriations are neither businesslike nor wise.

These tests are being carried on on the most gigantic scale that has ever been undertaken since the world was created, and here our Army and Navy insist upon spending millions upon millions of dollars merely for experimental purposes, when if they had somebody over there to stick around and see what was going on, who could come back and tell our officers in the War Department and the Navy Department what they saw and how it was done and the correct and approved way to do it, we could save millions of dollars in this experimental business.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield when he gets to a good stopping point?

Mr. HELM. Well, there is no good stopping point in this amendment, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. It is simply to let the gentleman know that any line of attack that is brought to the front there, which they may develop abroad, would have to be developed through experiments in our country, and we ought to have the money available. For instance, with submarines, when any new line of attack is developed we ought to be able to go on and remain abreast of those nations that are experimenting on a larger scale.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, if the Germans and the English and the French and the Russians work out these war problems, if they demonstrate what can be done in the air, on land and sea, and under the sea, why should we be expending several million dollars here to construct airships, submarines, and torpedoes that are ineffective for war, and if these nations can construct torpedoes or submarines and demonstrate how close you have to go to a warship before you fire, what is the use of our expending two or three million dollars to find out what the angle of departure and the distance of attack is, whether it is 400 yards or 200 yards, and the size, length, and caliber of the torpedo? It seems to me that it is perfect folly for this department to be insisting upon these unreasonable, enormous, and indefensible expenditures. When these problems are being worked out to a mathematical certainty, why should we spend several million dollars, especially when we are told that we are confronted with a deficit of \$80,000,000?

Mr. HOBSON. This is only a hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HELM. Well, a hundred thousand dollars for a particular type of shell; the bill is full of similar projects. If you will just be content and possess your soul in patience, the history of this war will be written, and these facts in due time will come out, and whether we want battleships hereafter or submarines or whether we want fast ocean cruisers, and the innumerable equations incidental to each. All of these things are being daily tested out. What man on this floor can get up and tell what any of these naval engagements turned on? What did the battle off the coast of Chile hinge on? What did the battle off the Falkland Islands hinge on? Why do you want to set up a target and shoot at it when the nations at war are

making daily tests on each other, and every phase of battle is being developed, from which instruction can be derived without cost?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any necessity for this increase in the appropriation, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. They speak of the experiments with the torpedo shells. We have expended already more than \$300,000 experimenting with them, and we are now conducting experiments provided for under the last bill that will cost between thirty and forty thousand dollars or more. The department says that this \$100,000 is all that will be needed next year. Our appropriations and our expenditures are going to be sufficiently heavy, and I think that we can very safely act upon the assumption that it is not necessary for us to crowd these increased appropriations upon the department. My experience has been that they ask for all that is needed, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Mr. BATHRICK addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. GARDNER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. HOBSON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 9, yeas 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. UNDERWOOD having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet to-morrow, Sunday, January 31, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the president of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co., transmitting report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1532); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. for the year ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1533); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a complete report for year 1914 of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., to be substituted for the report transmitted January 12, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1534); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting list of property in charge of the Sergeant at Arms on the 1st day of December, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1535); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of receipts and disbursements from December 1, 1913, to November 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1536); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the president of the Capital Traction Co., transmitting report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ending December 31, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1537); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.



## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 21257) to create the office of Chief of Naval Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 21258) to provide for the repaving and relaying of Broadway between the Watervliet Arsenal Grounds in the city of Watervliet, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) to suspend the final proviso of paragraph 177, Schedule E, of the act of October 3, 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 21259) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Shank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 21260) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Perry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 21261) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Roach, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 21262) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Overlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 21263) granting a pension to Sarah J. Floyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21264) granting a pension to Flossie M. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21265) granting an increase of pension to William Fralley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21266) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 21267) granting an increase of pension to R. F. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 21268) for the relief of the legal representatives of John S. Rogers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21269) for the relief of the legal representatives of E. Q. Rogers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 21270) for the relief of the Boonton Building and Loan Association, of Boonton, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of National Council, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of the Burnett Immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of Highland, Ill., protesting against Senate bill 6865, for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Gesangverein Concordia of Concordia, Pa., and Trinity Evangelical Church, of Sheridanville; Branch 14, Knights of St. George, and sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: Memorial of Merchants' Association of New York and Shipowners' Association of the Pacific coast protesting against passage of ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of George W. Haskell and 45 other citizens of South Pasadena, Cal., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Louisiana mass meeting committee, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Mabel Vail, Sarah Huestis, Eunice F. Strathman, Charles H. Johnston, and Isabel Johnston, all of Pasadena, Cal., and Alice E. and Paul Hutchinson, of Altadena, Cal., protesting against increased appropriations for war preparations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Fred Rische, Dr. E. Bentzein, Wisconsin Verein No. 8, L. Bannam, and 162 others, all residents of Milwaukee County, Wis., indorsing and urging the pas-

sage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of 108 citizens of Napa, Cal., favoring passage of Senate bill 6688, to lay embargo on arms shipped from United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Fulton Street Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5139, for retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of National Council Daughters of Liberty, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the New York Commandery of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, favoring creation by Congress of a national-defense commission; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 18666, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Fr. Brede, O. A. Chadde, Hermann Duill, J. D. Garin, A. H. Gefell, Sylvester Hasenauer, Dr. M. S. Jacobson, H. J. Karweick, John Karweick, Charles Kermann, G. G. Kircher, Edward Lederthell, Christian Lohfinch, Fred Meyer, Fred Nettelmann, J. H. Oberlies, W. F. Steinwachs, Rudolph Schlotz, Philip Weber, and Wilhelm Weichbrodt, all in the city of Rochester, N. Y., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against passage of the ship-purchase bill (H. R. 18666); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Rev. G. Muhlhauser and 44 others, of Hamlin, N. Y., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of Roman Catholic State League of South Dakota, and sundry citizens of South Dakota, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Baraboo (Wis.) Commercial Association, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of National Council, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARR: Resolutions adopted by the priests of the Scranton (Pa.) diocese, against "certain libelous, obscene, and scurrilous publications regarding priests, nuns, and Catholics in general," transmitted through the United States mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of J. J. Murphy, Patrick O'Hara, M. Good, J. F. M. Quillan, James O'Hara, W. A. Butler, S. M. Hartman, P. I. Dougher, John Hyland, M. Napka, F. J. Lanover, Daniel Conroy, John Meehand, J. L. Casey, of Olyphant; T. V. Gallagher, of Peckville; J. P. Gillespie, Henry Hough, Gerald Lanan, J. J. O'Hara, Thomas Good, Frank Farrell, Thomas Henry, J. J. Casey, John T. Taylor, R. M. Lynch, Thomas Meehand, Bernard Carr, James McNale, P. J. Swift, Patrick Conmy, John F. Kilcullen, Peter Foley, Edward Conroy, M. J. Ruddy, Philip Hastings, John G. McCormick, Patrick O'Malley, J. W. Jordan, B. M. Kennedy, M. J. Carrington, B. J. Lynch, C. V. Robinson, Edward Norton, James L. Kilcullen, Gerald Twaddle, J. J. Dodgson, John J. Loftus, Joseph L. Kennedy, James E. Loftus, Thomas Donnelly, Charles Williams, Patrick Mackrell, James Mackrell, W. L. Burke, William Boland, James J. Flynn, John J. Price, M. F. Walsh, John F. McLaughlin, James Miskell, John Keegan, W. F. Shea, Michael Murphy, Henry Hall, Rev. E. Kuger, William Patten, George R. Mason, Joseph Hines, James L. O'Malley, Frank Sullivan, Thomas J. Doherty, John J. Flynn, H. V. Boland, John Kane, John A. Dempsey, John Dougherty, N. F. Byrne, Michael Lynch, Frank J. Brogan, T. F. Fadden, J. C. Boland, T. J. Carey, John P. Quinn, Edward Hoban, sr., P. F.

McHale, H. O'Boyle, T. F. Swannick, William Patten, of Olyphant; James Harton, Rev. Joseph Dudkiewicz, of Priceburg; James Hughes, of Jessup; Rev. W. Kurytomir, of Old Forge; J. M. Gallagher, John Flynn, of Peckville; Rev. John W. Healey, F. J. Buruk, M. J. Walsh, P. J. Kilken, J. A. Dempsey, of Jermy; J. F. Homer, Joseph A. Reed, Rev. A. J. Brennan, Rev. Frank V. Zurisatti, Rev. George Oziz, Rev. A. Hopkins, J. L. Pistor, E. V. Brennan, of Scranton; and priests of diocese of Scranton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the circulation of certain anti-Catholic periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Board of Aldermen of New York City, against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of a law providing that when a citizen of one State is acquitted of any and all charges of crime in another State that he should be allowed to return to his own State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring appropriation for coast survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petitions of Rev. P. G. Bergen and 109 others, citizens of Delphos; H. A. Brandt and 14 others, of Covington; W. J. Steinle and 44 others, of Delphos, Ohio, favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Frankford Arsenal Association, Philadelphia, Pa., against certain sections of Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and National Councils, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of immigration bill over President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Friends, of Philadelphia, Pa., against increase in national armament; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of F. E. Winslow, of Presque Isle, Me., and 45 other citizens, protesting against excluding certain papers from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of J. F. Emmons and others, of Grandin, Mo., protesting against the enactment of House bill 20644, being a bill to prohibit the circulation through the mails of scurrilous, indecent, and libelous publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition favoring the enactment of House joint resolution 377, signed by Rev. John Krueger and others, of Farrar, Mo.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition favoring the enactment of House joint resolution 377, House joint resolution 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548, to prohibit the sale and export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations at present at war in Europe, signed by I. F. Silberstein, F. W. Hoetker, and others, of De Soto, Mo.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 20919, for the relief of Edward H. Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Communications of Herman Vater, George Wessels, Christian F. Recknagel, and Louis Lehr, all of New Britain, Conn., concerning House joint resolution 377, House joint resolution 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Osage, Nebr., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of sundry citizens of Johnson County, Nebr., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Clinton, Conn., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Petition of Germania Lodge, 507, Deutschen Orden der Hengari, Chattanooga, Tenn., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I., relative to adoption of the metric system in the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of W. R. Warburton, State secretary Knights of Columbus, Providence, R. I., favoring protection of Catholic clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of H. M. King, Providence, R. I., favoring the Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of citizens of New York, protesting against export of war material by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petitions of Tow Bralego Orlas Pogoni of Z. N. P., of Milford, and Polish Falcon Athletic Association of Meriden, Conn., protesting against passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of members of St. Francis German Society, protesting against the publication called the Menace being sent through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Friends of Our Native Landscape, Chicago, Ill., favoring project for a Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of J. H. Morrison and other citizens of Weiser, Idaho, favoring the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of W. R. Plughoff and other citizens of Hailey, George Harrigfield and others and Adolf Claussen and others of American Falls, all of Idaho, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of citizens of Texas, against bill providing prohibition for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Texas, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petitions from the German-American Alliance, of Hartford, Conn.; and citizens of Laramie, Wyo.; Evansville, Ind.; Nebraska; Philadelphia; and New Britain, Conn., memorializing Congress to place an embargo on all contraband of war excepting foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of 6,250 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Gravity, Iowa, relating to the enforcement of the pension laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of citizens of Boone County, Iowa, relative to branding of foreign agricultural products offered for sale in the United States so as to indicate the country from which same was imported; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of North Dakota State League of the Fargo Diocese and the German Roman Catholic Central Verein, Berwick, N. Dak., favoring resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, January 31, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Mr. UNDERWOOD, Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal energy, our God and our Father, out of whose heart came life and all its possibilities, the wisdom that illumines, the faith that sustains, the hope that cheers, the love which binds us together into friendship and families; we are here to-day because of these indissoluble ties in memory of two souls who have answered the summons and passed into the great beyond from whence no traveler returns. To recall their deeds, sing their praises is to put an estimate on their virtues. We thank Thee that the good in man lives to inspire others to the nobler virtues. These men were chosen servants of the